

the modification of the eighteenth amendment or the return of legalized beer, and urging adequate appropriations for law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9705. Also, petition of Rhoda Clement and sundry other citizens of Richland and Orwell, N. Y., favoring the so-called stop-alien representation amendment in future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9706. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the General Henry W. Lawton, No. 21, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, urging favorable consideration of all legislation in defense of the Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9707. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, urging more concrete economies in Federal expenditures and not additional taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9708. Also, petition of Peter Henderson & Co., seedsmen, of New York City, urging the passage of the bill restoring first-class mail to the 2-cent rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9709. Also, petition of the Pan-American Bureau, credit adjusters, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging that the first-class mail be put back on the 2-cent rate, and that the lower rates be increased at once so that such service may be self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9710. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, protesting against questions 3 and 4 of referendum No. 64 on governmental debts due to the United States, a referendum of the United States Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9711. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of Blanche Fulton and approximately 60 others, urging the passage of stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on Labor.

9712. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce, Manhattan, Kans., making certain recommendations for legislation concerning railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9713. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Joplin, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 11642; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9714. Also, petition urging support of railway pension bills, S. 4646 and H. R. 9891; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9715. Also, letters from W. B. Flint, local manager Long-Bell Lumber Sales Corporation of Ames, and B. M. Coombs, local manager Long-Bell Lumber Sales Corporation of Medford, Okla., urging support of House bill 13790, for the protection of American industry and labor against foreign intrusion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9716. By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Petition of Florence M. Palmer and other residents of Cortland County, N. Y., favoring the stop-alien amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9717. By Mr. KOPP: Petition of Rev. F. C. Witzigman and other citizens of Washington, Iowa, urging support of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9718. Also, petition of Rev. Arthur A. Vinz and many other citizens of Washington, Iowa, urging support of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9719. Also, petition of J. O. Crawford and many other citizens of Washington, Iowa, urging support of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9720. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Resolution of the Oakland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Topeka, Kans., opposing any legislation tending to nullify, weaken, or repeal the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act and urging adequate appropriations for the enforcement thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9721. Also, petition of the Oakland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Topeka, Kans., urging the establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission; declare the motion-picture industry a public utility, to regulate the trade

practices of the industry, to supervise the selection and treatment of subject matter during the processes of production, and providing for the regulation and supervision of all pictures in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9722. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, referring to governmental debts due the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9723. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, referring to additional taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9724. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petitions of citizens of the State of Indiana, protesting against discriminatory operation of busses and trucks against railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9725. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Carrie H. Ayer, chairman of a public meeting, proposing to legalize beer and repeal or modify the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9726. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Merchants Association of New York, referring to taxation, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9727. Also, petition of J. & L. Adikes, flour and bakers' supplies, Jamaica, N. Y., opposing the domestic-allotment plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9728. Also, petition of Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., referring to governmental debts due to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9729. Also, petition of Peter Henderson & Co., New York City, referring to first-class postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9730. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of Idaho, protesting against the enactment of House bill 13558; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

9731. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of citizens of Osborne, Downs, Cawker City, Bloomington, and Portis, Kans., submitted by J. W. Chandler and signed by 37 others, favoring the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9732. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Whitewater, Mich., opposing the action of Congress in attempting to legalize the sale of intoxicating beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1933

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 19, 1933:

S. 4791. An act to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the city of Prescott municipal watershed in the Prescott National Forest within the State of Arizona;

S. 5183. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa.; and

S. 5231. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

On January 20, 1933:

S. 5252. An act providing for payment of \$25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

On January 21, 1933:

S. 4095. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 409-411), by extending its provisions to provide for the punishment of stealing or otherwise unlawful taking of property from passenger cars, sleeping cars, or dining cars, or from passengers on such cars while such cars are parts of interstate trains, and authorizing prosecution therefor in any district in which the defendant may have taken or been in possession of the property stolen or otherwise unlawfully taken.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 5160) to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1933, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, Mr. LARSEN, Mr. HAUGEN, and Mr. PURNELL were appointed managers on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 5059. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., and a point at or near Alburgh, Vt.; and

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1933.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Couzens	Kean	Russell
Austin	Cutting	Kendrick	Schuyler
Bailey	Dale	Keyes	Sheppard
Barbour	Davis	King	Shipstead
Barkley	Dickinson	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Fess	Lewis	Smith
Blaine	Fletcher	Logan	Smoot
Borah	Frazier	Long	Steiwer
Bratton	George	McGill	Swanson
Brookhart	Glass	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Glenn	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkey	Gore	Neely	Trammell
Bulow	Grammer	Norbeck	Tydings
Byrnes	Harrison	Nye	Vandenberg
Capper	Hastings	Oddie	Wagner
Caraway	Hawes	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Coolidge	Hebert	Reynolds	Watson
Copeland	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	White

Mr. HEBERT. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. METCALF] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] are absent on official business, visiting Muscle Shoals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

A concurrent resolution requesting the Senate of the United States to ratify the seaway treaty

Whereas there is now being considered by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate what is known as "The Seaway Treaty"; and

Whereas the ratification of said treaty will clear the way for extending ocean carriage 1,500 miles inland to the heart of the continent; and

Whereas it is, therefore, to the great interest of the United States that said treaty be speedily ratified: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina does hereby petition the Senate of the United States to ratify "The Seaway Treaty" during the present session of Congress; and it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the United States Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from Benjamin J. Rehert, of Baltimore, Md., making suggestions relative to commodity prices and banking, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Umatilla County Pomona Grange, Freewater, Oreg., favoring the passage of legislation to make effective a bounty or subsidy in connection with the tariff on wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Sidney M. Smoot and sundry other citizens (being single men and widowers) of the District of Columbia, praying that in the distribution of the \$625,000 recently appropriated for the relief of needy residents of the District of Columbia that single men and widowers be not discriminated against and that such fund be not distributed solely to married persons and single women, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also laid before the Senate an affidavit signed by Eduarda K. Baltuff (Harris), of Savannah, Ga., relative to the alleged so-called ZEV conspiracy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Solon W. Bingham, of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of the so-called Sparks-Capper stop alien representation amendment to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of C. L. Woodward and sundry other citizens of Sullivan County, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law so as to permit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the East Pasadena Church of the Nazarene, the First Church of the Nazarene, the Bresee Church of the Nazarene, and the Foursquare Gospel Church, all of Pasadena, Calif., protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented letters and telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry banks and citizens in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the practice of giving publicity to loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. GRAMMER presented resolutions adopted by the Chambers of Commerce of Forks and Wenatchee, and also West Seattle Post No. 160, the American Legion, of Seattle, all in the State of Washington, favoring the passage of legislation to compensate for depreciated foreign currencies, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented resolutions adopted by the Detroit (Mich.) Council of Churches, favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, such measure of disarmament of the nations as can be effected at this time, and the peaceful solution of international disputes, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Berrien Springs, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of legislation to modify the national prohibition law so as to permit the manufacture and sale of beer with an alcoholic content of 4 per cent according to volume, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROOKHART presented resolutions adopted by 69 members of the W. C. T. U., of Nevada, and 300 members of the W. C. T. U., of Oskaloosa, in the State of Iowa, protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Terril, Spirit Lake, and Milford, and of Mrs. C. A. McLarnand and other citizens of Macksburg, T. H. Jeys and other citizens of Cresco, Mrs. Mack Robinson and other citizens of Winterset, and Rev. M. A. Wyman and other citizens of Centerville, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Thomas E. Atkinson Association (Inc.), of the State of New York, favoring the financing of the construction of the Tri-Boro Bridge through a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Good Citizenship League, of Flushing, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the exclusion of aliens in the count of population for the appointment of Representatives in Congress, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Bronxville, New Rochelle, Mount Vernon, Hastings, and Larchmont, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the curtailment or elimination of appropriations for the maintenance of citizens' military training camps, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Branch No. 42, the Fleet Reserve Association, of the Bronx, N. Y., and vicinity, remonstrating against proposed reductions in the pay of enlisted men of the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Rockland County Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, of New York State, favoring the making of adequate appropriations for the maintenance of the Regular Army, the National Guard, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, citizens' military training camps, annual rifle matches, and civilian rifle clubs, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Yonkers Teutonia, of Yonkers, and Erste Jablohower Lodge, No. 477, I. O. B. A., of New York City, in the State of New York, favoring the repeal of the so-called economy act, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Rochester and vicinity, in the State of New York, remonstrating against proposed reductions in appropriations for and in the personnel of the Marine Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a resolution adopted at Rochester, N. Y., by the New York State Horticultural Society favoring the ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway treaty with Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Gen. Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 21, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against curtailment of pensions, disability allowances, and compensation to veterans of the Spanish-American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Dolgeville Exchange Club, of Dolgeville, N. Y., favoring Federal regulation of common carriers on the highways and by water-transportation agencies, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against proposed legislation providing for agricultural relief through the so-called domestic-allotment plan, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of New York, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted at Rochester, N. Y., by the New York State Horticultural Society, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish within the Treasury Department a stabilization bureau for the perpetuation of the gold standard, which was ordered to lie on the table.

FEDERAL LAND-BANK PRACTICES IN MONTANA

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have a communication from a very high-class lawyer of my State, who writes me concerning foreclosures instituted and prosecuted by the Federal land bank at Spokane. It contains information of a character so important that I am going to ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD in full. I want to invite the attention of Senators particularly to a few paragraphs of the letter.

Having referred to the appropriation of \$125,000,000 made by Congress primarily for purposes of enabling the Federal land banks to grant extensions to borrowers in these times, he calls my attention to actual cases of foreclosures that are now being prosecuted in the county in which he lives. In this connection he says:

Our Federal land bank has woefully fallen down as an aid to our farmers and has, indeed, become a considerable factor in their destruction. Many of the foreclosures, in fact most of them, could have been avoided. When one recalls that each payment of an amortization installment retires a portion of the principal debt, it is apparent that some leniency could be extended farmers who are honest and able but, through the misfortune of grasshoppers, drought, and low prices, can not meet their payments.

Particularly is this true in cases gathered for illustration from my notes where foreclosures were pressed in this county. I will burden this letter with a few of them:

An instance where 11 installments had been paid, 2 were delinquent, and 4 years of taxes unpaid.

Another, where 21 payments had been made, 2 delinquent installments, and 2 years of delinquent taxes.

Again, one of 13 payments, with 2 delinquent installments, and no delinquent taxes.

Another instance of 11 installments and a part of the twelfth having been paid, with 2 delinquent installments and 2 years of delinquent taxes.

Another, where 20 amortization payments were made, with 6 delinquent semiannual installments and no delinquent taxes.

And so it runs, in similar manner, with 13, 15, and as high as 21 payments. Giving you something concrete, gathered from their foreclosure record, an instance where 16 amortization payments of \$325 each had been paid, or a payment of \$5,200 of a loan of \$9,700, covering 1,073.44 acres, there were 2 delinquent payments of \$650 and delinquent taxes amounting to \$494.52.

He adds:

I have personally read too many of the series of correspondence emanating from the bank and the borrower to be mistaken in this respect. The unfortunate farmer is set upon and harassed by the field agent, the management of the bank, and its legal department until driven to desperation. Our farmers in this area are almost altogether unable to meet their payments. Nearly all of them, or a big percentage of them at least, have delinquent taxes, and they are, I should judge from many recent consultations, all or nearly all in danger of foreclosure.

Somebody wrongly reports the policies of this bank to Washington. I heard President Hoover, in his address at Des Moines, say that they were not prosecuting foreclosures and had not been foreclosing except in those instances where the farmer himself surrendered to the inevitable. This is not an exact quotation, but it is in effect what he said, and I wondered if that was reported to him by the Federal Land Bank Board. If so, it is in keeping with what must have been said, at least, by our regional bank.

I talked with a responsible agricultural agent of the Milwaukee Railroad some time ago, and he was amazed at my narration of the true facts and circumstances concerning the bank's policies, for he had recently conversed with the officers of the regional

banks and they had declared in harmony with President Hoover's statement.

Nevertheless, these foreclosures are taking place in every instance where the farmer does not submit to the ruinous practice of giving everything he has as security, placing himself in a position where he will be pauperized when foreclosure takes place, and, in addition, confronted with a deficiency judgment.

Mr. President, I should not take the time to put this in the RECORD were it not for the fact that it is simply cumulative. Further evidence of the same character comes to me, and I have noted that the same policy is being pursued throughout the United States. Obviously this merits the attention of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The letter is as follows:

LEWISTOWN, MONT., January 9, 1933.

HON. THOMAS J. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I have had in mind for a considerable period of time taking up with you the situation confronting our farmers in Montana in their relations with the Federal Land Bank of Spokane.

Last spring one of the service clubs of this city, expressing alarm at the growing number of foreclosures and the apparent helplessness of our farmers to protect themselves, requested that I prepare and deliver an address on the subject of the operation and policies of the Federal land bank. To this subject I devoted considerable time and made an investigation of the conduct of its business in the Judith Basin, which I think fairly reflects its business methods elsewhere and, as I also judge, its business methods in other regional banks.

This latter observation is prompted by an article appearing in the October 8 number of *Colliers*, by an author named White. His article quite clearly parallels, in its narration of facts, the innumerable instances of our Spokane bank in its operations in this area.

Later on I was again called upon to address a meeting of the chamber of commerce on the same subject and I, at that time, had secured some additional information. Since August, 1929, and up to the date of the assembling of my data for the addresses mentioned (which has been considerably added to since), the Federal land bank had foreclosed upon 33,454 acres of land in Fergus County.

Loans made by the bank are all amortization loans and run almost uniformly 32-year tenures. Under the provisions of section 771, title 12, U. S. C. A., as you are aware, this is the exclusive method of making loans.

The original capital for these regional banks was prescribed as \$750,000. (Sec. 691, U. S. C. A.) Under the provisions of section 695, U. S. C. A., after the books of the bank were open for 30 days for subscriptions, it was made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe for all stock not privately subscribed for. (Sec. 695, U. S. C. A.)

I have been unable to ascertain definitely just who the stockholders are in the regional banks at the present time, but it is contemplated by the act, of which the cited sections are a part, that these land banks shall be under the control of the United States Government through a national board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, ex officio, and five other members selected by the President. (Sec. 652, U. S. C. A.)

I need now make no mention of the splendid plan and purpose. In March of last year Congress appropriated, to be used in the form of a subscription, \$125,000,000, distributed among the 12 Federal land banks. Two million dollars of this appropriation was made available to the Spokane bank. In March, 1932, E. M. Ehrhardt, president of the Spokane bank, was quoted by the Associated Press to the effect that, since the appropriation did not "constitute a moratorium or general extension of time to those who have received loans," there would be no such construction of its provisions. He directed attention to the fact that the principal and interest due to the bank from borrowers each year exceeded \$7,000,000, and argued that it is clear that the \$2,000,000 made available "would be exhausted in less than four months if wholesale extensions were granted."

It will be recalled that additional funds may be obtained by the banks through the pyramiding of bond issues and I suspect that, if private capital is involved to any considerable extent, the troubles I shall point out flow naturally from that fact in conjunction with other sources of loss of profit.

However that may be, our Federal land bank has woefully fallen down as an aid to our farmers, and has, indeed, become a considerable factor in their destruction. Many of the foreclosures, in fact, most of them, could have been avoided. When one recalls that each payment of an amortization installment retires a portion of the principal debt, it is apparent that some leniency could be extended farmers who are honest and able but through the misfortune of grasshoppers, drouth, or low prices can not meet their payments.

Particularly is this true in cases gathered for illustration from my notes where foreclosures were pressed in this county. I will burden this letter with a few of them: An instance where 11 installments had been paid, 2 were delinquent, and 4 years of taxes were unpaid;

Another where 21 payments had been made, 2 delinquent installments, and 2 years of delinquent taxes;

Again, one of 13 payments, with 2 delinquent installments, and no delinquent taxes;

Another instance of 11 installments and a part of the twelfth having been paid, with two delinquent installments, and two years of delinquent taxes;

Another where 20 amortization payments were made, with 6 delinquent semiannual installments and no delinquent taxes.

And so it runs, in similar manner, with 13, 15, and as high as 21 payments. Giving you something concrete, gathered from their foreclosure record, an instance where 16 amortization payments of \$325 each had been paid, or a payment of \$5,200 of a loan of \$9,700, covering 1,073.44 acres, there were two delinquent payments of \$650 and delinquent taxes amounting to \$494.52.

In every instance, so far as I know—and I think the statement is correct—it is the policy of the bank in foreclosing to take a deficiency judgment; and I am reliably informed that it has been viciously stated, by responsible men in the bank, that this is done for the purpose of making an example of the farmer. Their field agents are particularly vicious.

The mode of procedure is almost universally as follows: When the farmer fails to pay an installment of taxes, or an amortization installment, he is campaigned at once to make out a financial statement. I have never seen a more complete blank for searching out every last resource than the blank sent out for this purpose. He is then told that he will be granted an extension for the next ensuing installment, if he will give a chattel mortgage on everything he owns and including the crops to be raised the next season.

Senator WALSH, I have personally read too many of the series of correspondence emanating from the bank and the borrower to be mistaken in this respect. The unfortunate farmer is set upon and harassed by the field agent, the management of the bank, and its legal department until driven to desperation. Our farmers in this area are almost altogether unable to meet their payments. Nearly all of them, or a big percentage of them, at least, have delinquent taxes, and they are, I should judge from many recent consultations, all, or nearly all, in danger of foreclosure.

Somebody wrongly reports the policies of this bank to Washington. I heard President Hoover, in his address at Des Moines, say that they were not prosecuting foreclosures and had not been foreclosing except in those instances where the farmer himself surrendered to the inevitable. This is not an exact quotation, but it is in effect what he said, and I wondered if that was reported to him by the Federal Land Bank Board. If so, it is in keeping with what must have been said at least by our regional bank.

I talked with a responsible agricultural agent of the Milwaukee Railroad some time ago, and he was amazed at my narration of the true facts and circumstances concerning the bank's policies, for he had recently conversed with the officers of the regional bank and they had declared in harmony with President Hoover's statement.

Nevertheless these foreclosures are taking place in every instance where the farmer does not submit to the ruinous practice of giving everything he has as security, placing himself in a position where he will be pauperized when foreclosure takes place, and, in addition, confronted with a deficiency judgment.

It hardly seems to me proper to take up so much of your time in considering this matter. It is difficult, however, to apprise you of what the law offices know is the practical situation and hold down the statements to reasonable brevity. I commend to you, if you have not already read it, the article in *Colliers*, and also shall be very glad to elaborate this statement, giving you a complete transcript of foreclosures and their practical basis, as exemplified by our records here.

If I may talk in the abstract for a paragraph or two, I wish to say that a complete and thorough congressional investigation of the operation of the Federal land banks should be made. I can name, of our most highly responsible farmers here, a goodly number who, if they produced the correspondence with their bank and narrated their experiences in this connection, would horrify any committee making the investigation.

I suspect that greed of gain is entering in and it seems to me high time that this institution should be thwarted in its apparent purpose to drive the farmers out of existence and make of them tenant farmers. I am satisfied that the truth is not known generally and I believe the *Colliers* article is putting the case mildly. I know that this letter only hints at the calamity that is rapidly overtaking our farmers in the Judith Basin.

It is my suggestion that those members of the national board should be most thoroughly investigated before appointment to the end that they prove not to be simply the agents of private capital, in doing what the act was not designed to do. I have no doubt that money has been made by the banks by the use of Federal appropriations in the repurchase of bond issues.

I am sure that if this has been called to your attention, you have taken steps to remedy the matter, but if perchance your information has come from official sources, I feel sure that that has been of a misleading nature. No investigation which does not result in the hearing of testimony of the borrowers will give any adequate idea of the autocracy of this institution in its operation.

For more than 20 years I have been connected with our local banks and I am now still a director in one of them, and I believe I understand sound banking and proper banking methods. I solicit from you such further correspondence in the matter as you care to have with me and assure you that I shall do everything in my power to acquaint you with the practical situation in any way

you suggest, but I do say without hesitation that if our farmers are to be saved something must be done, and done now.

I trust, my dear Senator, that I have not unduly burdened you with what, I think, is of great moment to our farmers, and I am sure that whatever seems advisable your experience will enable you to do.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

H. LEONARD DEKALB.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS COMMITTEE

Mr. WALSH of Montana, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 4674) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to school sections 16 and 36, granted to the States by the act approved February 22, 1889, by the act approved January 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1026), and by any other act of Congress, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1104) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, January 21, 1933, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 5059) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., and a point at or near Alburgh, Vt.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5476) granting a pension to Fannie Standiford (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5477) granting an increase of pension to Jane Paro (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 5478) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians in the State of Utah for certain coal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5479) for the relief of George B. Marx; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

A bill (S. 5480) giving the protection of the law to the worker's right to work and guaranteeing him an equal share of the employment available; forming trade associations to effectuate such rights and to enable such industries to stabilize business and to provide certain benefits for their employees; and imposing certain excise taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

A bill (S. 5481) authorizing persons, firms, corporations, associations, or societies to file bills of interpleader or bills in the nature of interpleader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 5482) granting a pension to Thomas A. Rinehart (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 5483) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior in behalf of Indians to purchase the allotments of deceased Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 5485) establishing a State game refuge on islands in the Egg Lakes in the White Earth Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. NEELY, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2231) for the relief of Henry C. Perrine, and it was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

On motion of Mr. BARBOUR, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys was discharged from the further consideration

of the bill (S. 5469) to provide for the creation of the Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes, and it was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENT TO THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HEBERT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13520, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 79, line 18, after "16," to insert "(a)"; and on page 80, after line 7, to insert the following:

"(b) Section 319 of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, shall not apply to any refund or credit allowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue prior to July 1, 1932, on account of an overpayment in respect of any internal revenue tax. Appropriations for the payment of any such refund, as well as for the payment of interest upon any such refund or credit, shall be available for the payment of principal and interest computed in accordance with the laws with respect to interest in force at the time of the allowance of such refund or credit."

EXPENSES, THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE AERIAL LAW (S. DOC. NO. 175)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an appropriation in the sum of \$3,500 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the third international conference on private aerial law to be held in Rome, Italy, in 1933.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 1933.

REPORT OF THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 6 of the trading with the enemy act, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Alien Property Custodian on proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act for the year ended December 31, 1932.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 1933.

PROHIBITION REPEAL—ADDRESS BY JOUETT SHOUSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address by Hon. Jouett Shouse upon the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, the address having been delivered on January 17 at Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The outcome of repeal legislation at the moment hangs in the balance. It would be perfectly simple to get Congress to submit a resolution modifying the eighteenth amendment. The recent action of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate indicates that it may be quite difficult—if not impossible—to secure from the present Congress a resolution for outright repeal.

On the opening day of the winter session there was offered in the House of Representatives a proposal which met the expectations of the country with reference to repeal and which fulfilled the promise of the Democratic platform—a pledge that received overwhelming indorsement in the November elections. This resolution, presented under suspension of the rules and not subject to amendment, received a vote of 272 as against 144, only 6 less than the two-thirds necessary to its passage through the House.

That vote represented a sweeping victory for repeal because the same House less than nine months before had refused even to consider mere modification by a vote of 187 for and 227 against the motion to bring up the Beck-Linthicum measure for action.

Monday of last week the Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported out a resolution to be considered in that body. This resolution represents an unfortunate attempt at political expediency. It seems an apparent effort to ignore the mandate of the

people as given in the last election and to continue the ignoble experiment of Federal control of legislation which affects peculiarly the life and habits of the people and which, under our form of government, has its only proper place in the several States.

The first section of this Senate anomaly provides for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. The next two sections nullify the first, for they seek, instead of correcting the situation that has grown up with the attempt of Federal enforcement of a police statute, to prolong the necessity of Federal jurisdiction in an intolerable way.

With section 2 of the resolution I have no particular quarrel, although admittedly it is superfluous. It would seek to put into the Constitution the protection of so-called dry States against the shipment of liquor from outside territory. The power to afford such protection is already inherent in the Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution, and legislation with this in view has been on the statute books for years, as embodied in the Webb-Kenyon law and the Reed rider of the postal appropriation bill.

The constitutionality of the Webb-Kenyon Act was attacked immediately after its passage some 20 years ago. The case wended its tortuous way through the courts and a decision was not handed down by the Supreme Court for approximately four years, but that decision when made upheld the constitutionality of the law and thus upheld the right of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution to pass all legislation necessary to protect States whose laws prohibit the importation or sale of spirituous liquors from invasion of their rights. Moreover, the validity of the Webb-Kenyon Act and of other legislation along similar lines has been in no wise affected by the adoption of the eighteenth amendment or the passage of the Volstead law. This fact was emphasized by the Supreme Court in a decision rendered as recently as May of last year.

In these circumstances it is apparent that the constitutional power embodied in section 2 of the resolution now pending before the Senate is wholly unnecessary. As before stated, however, I have no particular quarrel with this proposed provision, for if its inclusion in the repeal resolution will give a greater feeling of security to those States which may desire to remain dry after the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, then I am perfectly willing that they should have such assurance.

It is with the third section of the pending resolution that I take definite issue. That section reads as follows: "Congress shall have concurrent power to regulate or prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to be drunk on the premises where sold."

An expression of intent which starts out with provision for repeal of the eighteenth amendment and later embodies within its terms the assertion of Federal power in the control of the method of the sale of liquor is wholly inconsistent. It is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, nor even good red herring. The attempt to enforce it would involve most of the evils of the present system and probably new evils of which we do not now have knowledge. It would mean a continuance of huge Federal expenditures to maintain an army of snoopers and snipers. It would mean a continuance of the reign of racketeering and crime, of bribery and corruption, of Federal interference in the lives and habits of the people.

The Chicago Tribune puts it this way: "The folly of such a provision is not a matter for rational argument. It has been demonstrated by experience. It will perpetuate the speakeasy. It will keep prohibition in national politics. It will perpetuate the revolt of the people of the so-called wet States against the imposition of the will of dry States if the latter can muster a majority in Congress. It will leave the door open to a continuance of the methods of Federal enforcement, including the murder of citizens and the confiscation of property."

Some distinguished Members of the Senate have ventured the opinion that the concurrent power sought to be given would never be exercised by Congress. If that be true, then why confer it? The history of national legislation, however, has shown that wherever concurrent power or any other power was conferred Congress very promptly has proceeded to take advantage of the authority. And if the distinguished apologists for this indefensible section are right in their surmise that Congress might not at first care to exercise its jurisdiction, is it not irrefutable that there would be continuous effort by overzealous prohibitionists to induce, if not to compel, the Congress to legislate in accordance with this proposed section of the repeal amendment?

The practical fact is—and it is recognized by even those advocates of the section who are honest in their expressions concerning it—that this provision has been injected in order that there may be a continuance of Federal authority over a function that belongs peculiarly and properly to the States. The practical result is certain to be a renewed agitation of the whole prohibition question every time Congress meets, with the inevitable result of increased confusion and continuous discussion to the detriment of all proper duties of the National Legislature. As the New York Herald Tribune says, "the attempt would simply perpetuate the conditions of lawlessness that now prevail. And the authority to make it would render Congress forever a battle ground of the liquor controversy to the exclusion of its proper function."

And your own influential newspaper, the Louisville Courier-Journal, remarks that: "Instead of settling the disturbing liquor question, it would perpetuate that question. For every congressional campaign would be a desperate fight between the dries and the wets for the control of Congress, as the dries would realize that only through their control of Congress would they be able to con-

trol and abolish the rights of the States to attend to their own business in the regulation of the liquor traffic."

The Association Against the Prohibition Amendment does not desire to attempt dogmatic jurisdiction over legislation for prohibition reform. We do not believe that any outside group should assume to set itself up as the arbiter of congressional action. On the other hand, we feel that Congress is the servant, not the master, of the people, that its members have been chosen to make effective the popular will, and that where the people have expressed themselves clearly upon any given proposition the Congress which represents them must promptly and honestly put the mandate into effect.

As to the mandate of the last election there is no question. The men and women of America want the opportunity to pass upon the question of outright repeal of the eighteenth amendment. They do not purpose that the issue shall be circumscribed or embarrassed or confused by a lot of qualifications. The Senate resolution represents not what the people want or what they expect. It represents a perverted attempt to appeal to both wets and dries. It does not contemplate repeal of the eighteenth amendment but rather an abortive substitute which fails to embody what the people demand and what they are entitled to have.

In my judgment this deceptive make-shift will not pass, but, speaking for the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, if by any chance it should receive the necessary votes in the two Houses of Congress and be offered to the States for adoption, we shall do all we can to persuade the States to withhold ratification. There is both a duty and a responsibility involved to those groups which have contended for repeal. They must try to see that the character of resolution offered represents an honest attempt to deal with a grave problem. Our association would stultify its mental integrity, it would cast aspersions upon the reason for its creation, it would destroy the work of education that it has carried on for 12 years if it gave approval to—indeed if it did not frankly condemn—such a proposal as that brought forth by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

The New York Times made the following editorial comment in its issue of January 11:

"To add the last stroke of genius to this masterpiece of evasion, ratification by legislatures is substituted for ratification by State conventions."

It will be recalled that both the Republican and Democratic platforms adopted last June specified that any suggested constitutional amendment bearing upon prohibition should be referred for ratification, not to the legislatures of the several States but to conventions in the several States. Opposed in their attitudes on many phases of the subject there was absolute accord upon this provision. Further, it should be borne in mind that while in each convention two different platform planks upon prohibition were offered, every proposal that was considered embodied the convention method of reference. And to this provision not the slightest protest was made in either convention. Has it come to the point that Members of Congress will sit as delegates to a party convention and indorse one method of procedure which constitutes a definite pledge to the electorate and then sit as Members of Congress and adopt a form of procedure that is absolutely contrary to the promises made? By what excuse can such conduct be justified? Are party platforms to be considered mere scraps of paper? Do they represent the attempt to deceive rather than to educate the public as to what may be expected?

Naturally, there was a reason for the declaration in favor of the convention method of ratification. When President Hoover's Wickersham Commission made its report it called attention to the fact that the eighteenth amendment had been submitted for action by legislatures, thus depriving the masses of the people of any right to express themselves upon it. This circumstance was emphasized by the commission as one of the justified reasons for widespread dissatisfaction with the ratification of the amendment.

There can be no argument that if, even remotely, the attempt is to be made to establish a popular referendum upon the question of repeal it can be secured only through provision for ratification by State conventions. Members of legislatures are elected because of a variety of reasons. In the case of the legislatures now in session, or that will convene later this year, there was no contest anywhere between candidates on the subject of prohibition. The country accepted the mandate of the party platforms and assumed that Congress without question would refer its repeal proposal to conventions rather than to legislatures. But now it is urged in the Senate that the platform promises be entirely ignored, that the people again be deprived of the right to pass upon a question which so closely affects them, and that barter and trade and log-rolling, such as would be possible upon this subject in a legislative body, shall supersede direct expression of the popular will through State conventions.

It has been pointed out by the Scripps-Howard newspapers that under the legislative systems now prevailing in the States of the Union 132 State senators in 13 States would have it in their power to defeat ratification of the amendment. The opportunity so to do will be provided if the pending resolution should pass.

The legislative apportionment in the various States is not based upon population. The rural sections have representation that is wholly disproportionate to the urban centers. In some instances one member of the State senate is provided for each county, and whether the population of a county is 500 people or 500,000 people the system is not changed. Thus it is clear that our State legislatures as at present constituted do not offer the opportunity to

express the popular will or voice views that might obtain as a result of actual popular vote.

Upon what ground is excuse made for this action of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate? In so far as the press discloses its proceedings the motive of economy is given as the reason. It is asserted that the election of delegates to the State conventions and the holding of such conventions would involve an expense to the Federal Government of perhaps \$10,000,000.

Probably that is true. Let us accept it as a correct figure. Let us assume that the expense may reach an even larger sum. Even in these times of depression, would the Government not be justified in such an appropriation in order to secure an unqualified expression of the popular will upon this vexing and controversial question? And would it not be worth all that is suggested, and much more besides, for the people to have the opportunity to root out of their Constitution a police power which never belonged there and return to the States control over the entire liquor question?

It is undenied even by the most ardent advocate of prohibition that literally billions of dollars are involved now in the illicit liquor industry, and the Federal Government not only gathers no tax therefrom but is put to the expense of multiplied millions each year in the attempt to enforce an unenforceable law. On the ground of betterment of the fiscal affairs of the Nation there is every argument for prohibition reform. But there is even a higher right. The people of this country must be given the privilege of expressing themselves through their own conventions in the several States as to their wishes either for or against repeal. To-day there is widespread controversy as to how the people stand. Let us find out. The only method whereby a determination can be had is through the convention method of ratification.

Perhaps it is a mere coincidence, but there is a startling analogy in the fact that the defenders of the eighteenth amendment, those who earnestly advocate its continuance and its further attempted enforcement, practically without exception, take the position that if any resolution is to be submitted it shall be referred to legislatures. They admit that they propose this method because it will mean delay. Is not this of itself a compelling reason why those who favor repeal should insist upon reference to conventions? Certainly they may be assured thereby of two things: First, far more prompt action than could be achieved through legislatures, and, second, the opportunity for an honest and uncircumscribed expression of the popular will.

The Baltimore Sun takes the following editorial position: "There are compelling reasons why the issue should not be submitted to State legislatures. To do so would likely cause prolonged delay, inviting nation-wide participation in the fight in every State, offering opportunities for corruption, plunging the country into continued excitement and bad feeling, to say nothing of the chaotic conditions that would prevail while the issue was being settled."

A surprising development of the whole prohibition agitation of the last two months has been the assertion by many well-intentioned men and women, who honestly believe the eighteenth amendment should be retained, that the issue of prohibition was not involved in the recent election. Some of them have gone so far as to say that the people did not express themselves upon the question even remotely, that other considerations were responsible entirely for the verdict given.

It is interesting to contrast the contentions now voiced by these zealous advocates with their expressions following the election of 1928. Without exception they claimed in November of 1928 that the election of Herbert Hoover and a Republican Congress constituted a mandate from the American voters for retention of the eighteenth amendment. They declared unequivocally that it was a clear indorsement of national constitutional prohibition. For example, Mrs. Henry W. Peabody, chairman of the Women's National Committee for Law Enforcement, used this significant language:

"The election of Herbert Hoover is the answer to the cry for a referendum on the eighteenth amendment. The voters have declared they want more, not less, prohibition; more, not less, enforcement of the eighteenth amendment. Mr. Hoover and the Republican Party have received a mandate on this amendment." Mrs. Peabody asserted that the issue of the 1928 elections was "not the tariff nor the farm issue nor prosperity" but that it was prohibition.

Dr. F. Scott McBride, superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, declared in 1928: "Hoover's overwhelming victory is conclusive proof that the great majority of the American people wish prohibition to succeed. This result is an impressive and decisive repudiation by the people of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment."

The Rev. Dr. Clarence True Wilson, general secretary of the Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church, went a step farther. He said: "If Governor Smith and his partisans have the slightest regard for the interests of the Democratic Party, not to say of the country, they will surely accept the result of the election as final evidence that prohibition is the settled policy of the American people."

I have no desire either to challenge or to defend those interpretations of the election of 1928, but I have the right to insist that the men and women favorable to the eighteenth amendment shall be consistent.

Wholly aside from the fact that it was a Democrat rather than a Republican who was elected in 1932—and our association knows no partisanship—it is, of course, a matter of record that a presi-

dential candidate who stood 100 per cent for outright repeal and candidates for the Senate and House who stood with him on that platform were chosen over those who adhered to the principle of retention of a police regulation in the National Constitution. If our friends among the drys correctly analyzed the election results of 1928, will they not be equally frank in their acceptance of the results of 1932?

The Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, chairman of the allied forces for prohibition, issued a statement to newspapermen in Washington on August 14 last, three days after President Hoover's acceptance speech. Doctor Poling declared he started out with an organization of 1,500,000 voters who would support Mr. Hoover while seeking to bring about the election of Members of the Senate and House who would oppose submission of the issue of repeal to the American people.

"The allied forces," Doctor Poling said, "will conduct an aggressive campaign for the election of Senators and Representatives, whether they be Democrats or Republicans, who are against repeal."

In a subsequent exchange of telegrams with President Hoover, made public on August 23, Doctor Poling said the indorsement of Mr. Hoover by the allied forces had received the "overwhelming approval" of the members of the various dry organizations, and he added, "This indorsement is already a rising tide that will, I believe, directly and largely affect election results in many States."

At Winona Lake, Ind., on August 19, 1932, Doctor McBride, of the Anti-Saloon League, stated the issue clearly and accurately when he said: "Our major task as to the coming campaign is clearly presented in the election of Congressmen, who, in the last analysis, have sole responsibility for amending the Constitution. We will support those candidates who stand definitely committed in opposition to either repeal or modification."

Doctor McBride and his associates had every right to do just what he suggested. I have not the slightest doubt that they carried out literally the plan made clear in his statement and that they placed behind candidates for national legislative office, who agreed with their views on the prohibition question, all of the vast resources of their combined organizations. I am happy that they did. It clarified the whole question. It made the issue plain to every voter. The result was recorded. Throughout the country those who stood for repeal were swept into office by overwhelming majorities, and the obviously proper course now is that the outcome be accepted and effort not be made to deny that prohibition was the real issue in multiplied instances.

The advocates of retention of the prohibition amendment of whom I speak are excellent men and women—law-abiding, God-fearing citizens. I question neither their loyalty nor their patriotism nor their good intent. And I call upon them, if they meant what they said with reference to the 1928 election, to accept the mandate of the election of 1932. I call upon them to cease their claims that the chosen national legislators were placed in office solely because they were Democrats, not because they were for repeal, and that therefore they have neither moral obligation nor political responsibility to support the platform declaration of the Democratic Party.

In no election in the history of our country has there been so overwhelming a majority given, both by popular vote and in the electoral college. The administration that comes into power on March 4, and the Congress chosen to serve with it, are charged with grave responsibility. The platform upon which these candidates stood represents their sacred compact with the American people. No other plank of that platform was quite so explicit, no other promise was quite so definite, as the pledge for repeal of the eighteenth amendment. The Seventy-third Congress is bound in a most positive way to meet the expectations of the people. I have every faith in its good intent and in its honesty of purpose. I feel assured that the resolution now pending before the Senate of the Seventy-second Congress, unless corrected to conform to Democratic platform promises, will be defeated in one or the other house of that Congress. I feel equally certain that among the first acts of the initial session of the Seventy-third Congress will be a resolution calling for outright repeal of the eighteenth amendment to be acted upon in conventions of the several States.

RESTRICTIONS APPLICABLE TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana obtained the floor.

Mr. FRAZIER. I present the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to House bill 8750. I understand that it is a privileged matter, and I ask unanimous consent that the report may be immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the report be read.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GLASS. Under what order of business are we now proceeding?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill of which the Senator from Virginia is in charge is now before the Senate, but the presentation of the report submitted by the Senator from

North Dakota is privileged and will not interfere with the bill of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LONG. It is privileged?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a privileged matter. The clerk will read the report.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit, in his discretion and subject to his approval, any Indian of the Five Civilized Tribes over the age of 21 years having restricted funds or other property subject to the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, to create and establish, out of the restricted funds or other property, trusts for the benefit of such Indian, his heirs, or other beneficiaries designated by him, such trusts to be created by contracts or agreements by and between the Indian and incorporated trust companies or such banks as may be authorized by law to act as fiduciaries or trustees: *Provided*, That no trust company or bank shall be trustee in any trust created under this act which has paid or promised to pay to any person other than an officer or employee on the regular pay roll thereof any charge, fee, commission, or remuneration for any service or influence in securing or attempting to secure for it the trusteeship in any trust: *Provided further*, That all trust agreements or contracts made or entered into prior to the date of approval of this act, and all contracts or agreements made or entered into prior to said date providing for or looking to the creation of such trust or trusts shall be null and void unless such contracts or agreements shall have heretofore been approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, upon the execution and approval of any trust agreement or contract as herein provided, to transfer, or cause to be transferred, to the trustee, from the individual restricted or trust funds or other restricted property of the respective Indian, the funds or property required by the terms of the approved agreement, and the funds or property so transferred shall in each case be held by the trustee subject to the terms and conditions of the trust agreement or contract creating the trust, separate and apart from all assets, investments, or trust estates in the hands of said trustee.

"Sec. 4. None of the restrictions upon the funds or property transferred under the terms of any such trust agreement or contract shall be in any manner released during the continuance of the restriction period now or hereafter provided by law, except as provided by the terms of such agreement or contract, and neither the corpus of said trust nor the income derived therefrom shall, during the restriction period provided by law, be subject to alienation, or encumbrance, nor to the satisfaction of any debt or other liability of any beneficiary of such trust during the said restriction period. The trustee shall render an annual accounting to the Secretary of the Interior and to the beneficiary or beneficiaries to whom the income for the preceding year, or any part thereof, was due and payable.

"Sec. 5. Trust agreements or contracts executed and approved as herein provided shall be irrevocable except with the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That if any trust, trust agreement, or contract be annulled, canceled, or set aside by order of any court, or

otherwise, the principal or corpus of the trust estate, with all accrued and unpaid interest, shall be returned to the Secretary of the Interior as restricted individual Indian property.

"Sec. 6. If, after the creation and approval of any trust, it is found that said trust was procured in violation of any of the provisions of this act, or that the trustee designated therein has failed or refused to properly perform the duties imposed thereby, in accordance with the terms, provisions, and requirements of said trust agreement, it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to institute appropriate proceedings in the Federal courts for the cancellation and annulment of said trust by court decree, and upon decree of annulment and cancellation, which shall be at the cost of the trustee, and after accounting, but without the allowance of any fee, charge, or commission for any services rendered by the trustee, all funds held by the trustee shall be paid to the Secretary of the Interior as restricted funds, and the Federal courts are hereby given exclusive jurisdiction of all actions involving an accounting under any trust created under the provisions of this act, and all actions to cancel, annul, or set aside any trust entered into pursuant to this act.

"Sec. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of this act. He shall fix and determine the value of each trust, reviewing such valuation from time to time as he may deem necessary, and, for the faithful performance of each trust agreement or contract, shall require corporate surety company bond equal to the value of the respective trust so fixed and determined, or the deposit of securities of the United States Government equal to such amount: *Provided, however*, That trusts created under the provisions of this act shall not extend beyond a period 21 years after the death of the last survivor of the named beneficiaries in the respective trust agreement."

And on page 2, line 18, of the House bill, strike out "2" and insert "8."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LYNN J. FRAZIER,
THOS. D. SCHALL,
ELMER THOMAS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDGAR HOWARD,
SCOTT LEAVITT,

Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee the full import of the conference report? Does it mean that the restrictions, if any, heretofore imposed by law upon the alienation of property shall be removed or that they are continued?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, may I answer that question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am sure this matter will take only a moment. The conference report has to do entirely with a measure affecting the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma. By operation of law the restriction period expired on certain funds and property about two years ago. This measure seeks to reimpose restrictions upon some of the large estates and vast sums of money in my State. That is the restriction feature of the bill. The second part is a trust provision similar to the bill which passed this body some five times. It adds to the restriction bill and makes it permissible for the Secretary of the Interior to create a trust estate for some of these rich Indians so that their funds may be protected and preserved. That is the whole import of the proposed law.

Mr. KING. If this bill does not remove restrictions on the alienation of land, I have no objection to it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It seeks to reimpose restriction upon certain Indians.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the matter for a few moments.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I can not yield for a discussion if it will take any considerable time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. LONG. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not care to go ahead of the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All in favor of adopting the report—

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, have I not the right to speak on that question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has if there is no objection to the consideration of the report; but if there is objection, the report will remain on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Let me inquire if the Senator from Louisiana expects to consume much time in what he has to say.

Mr. LONG. I should say I would occupy about 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then, I should like to proceed with the remarks I desire to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that the matter he has before the Senate at this time be held in abeyance for a few moments, until I shall have concluded? I think I will not detain the Senate more than a few moments.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to withdraw my objection to the conference report submitted by the Senator from North Dakota and allow it to go through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from North Dakota.

The report was agreed to.

BANKING ACT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 4412) to provide for the safer and more effective use of the assets of Federal reserve banks and of national banking associations, to regulate interbank control, to prevent the undue diversion of funds into speculative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield briefly.

Mr. WHEELER. In order to save time, I was going to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a vote on the Bratton amendment out of order, and for that purpose that there be laid aside temporarily the pending amendment and that the vote on the Bratton amendment be had at 1 o'clock today. I ask that my request for unanimous consent may be put.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the Senator will make it 1.30 o'clock, I think I shall be through long before 1 o'clock; but it will necessitate a quorum call, and I suggest, anyway, that he make the hour 1.30 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Action on the request will not require a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum call would not be required under the unanimous-consent request as proposed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. An agreement to vote on the amendment, if it should be made, would not require a call for a quorum.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Very well; I have no objection at all. I hope I will be through, and I think I shall, before that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Montana repeat his request?

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent that at 1 o'clock—I am not particular as to the exact hour and am willing to make it 1.30, if that is more satisfactory—that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate take a vote on the so-called Bratton amendment at that time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the suggestion of the Senator from Montana. The Senator from New Mexico, as I understand, intends to offer his amendment in a somewhat modified form, with some slight corrections. Would it not be better to offer it now?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I am sorry that I can not yield indefinitely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield further. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do not like to object, but I am a little fearful that I might not be able to finish within the time suggested.

Mr. WHEELER. I suggest that a vote be taken at 1.30, and I am assuming that the vote will be taken on the Bratton amendment as perfected by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, before the amendment is formally offered, I wish to perfect it in certain respects. Virtually all Senators interested in it are familiar with the proposed changes. I am entirely willing to offer it at 1.30, after having perfected it, and I should like to have a vote on it at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will have to be disposed of, because no other amendment is in order at this time.

Mr. LONG. We are asking for unanimous consent to allow the Bratton amendment to go ahead of all other amendments. That can be done, as I understand, only by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if this matter is going to lead to any further debate, I shall object.

Mr. FESS. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to facilitate the procedure as indicated, but I think we should have a few moments to understand the Bratton amendment when it is submitted. If the Senator from Indiana is going to occupy the floor until 1 o'clock or 1.30 o'clock, I submit it would scarcely be fair to call for an immediate vote thereafter. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that he renew his request when the Senator from Indiana shall have concluded, and suggest an hour beyond the time when the Senator from Indiana shall have finished.

Mr. WHEELER. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

FOREIGN DEBTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana will proceed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, Mr. Roosevelt, the President elect of the United States, has come and gone and reverberations in the public press have followed. Some of the headlines in this morning's newspapers, Mr. President, are disturbing to some of us who believe that the Congress of the United States has declared its policy on the foreign debts; and since the Congress of the United States has full authority to declare a policy on this question, it seems scarcely within the province of either the President or the President elect to undertake to alter that policy which has been definitely stated and in emphatic terms.

Mr. President, this morning the Baltimore Sun carries a headline reading as follows:

Doors opened wide by United States for debt adjustments by nations in good standing.

The "door is opened wide," although we had supposed, after Congress had acted last year, that the door had been definitely closed on that proposition.

The Philadelphia Inquirer carries a headline this morning reading as follows:

Roosevelt acts to reopen talks on British debt.

The Washington Post carries this headline:

Britons invited here to reopen debt issue.

And then follows a story, a part of which I read at this time:

Three hours after President-elect Roosevelt had left for his sojourn South yesterday Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson formally invited the British Government in his name to send representatives to Washington to confer on the war debts and "ways and means for improving the world situation." The invitation was transmitted through the British ambassador, Sir Ronald Lindsay, who called at the department last night to receive the invitation orally.

Then I read this statement from the same article:

The initiative for the step was taken by the President elect himself in the course of his informal talk with Colonel Stimson a fortnight ago.

It was learned authoritatively that the British Government has been making inquiries over a considerable period of time as to the most expedient way of opening the debt negotiations.

Mr. President, this is all amazing, I imagine, to the Members of both Houses of Congress who have declared their position in no uncertain terms on this question. Of course, everyone must understand perfectly that it merely gives encouragement to all those nations which owe enormous debts to the people of the United States to default in the payment of those obligations.

There is a very enlightening article in the New York Times of this morning, a part of which I quote:

Some observers are disposed to believe that, on the other hand, Mr. Roosevelt was warned last night by Democratic leaders that the next Congress will not agree to any reductions in the debt of any country, and that he authorized to-day's communiqué in part to inform those leaders that he is determined that they shall change their minds in the case of Great Britain. That, they assert, is the reason why, though he later said that "all debtors" may come to Washington with their cases, the request of Great Britain was stressed.

Mr. President, I do not know what authority the press has for making these statements, but I do know that the American press is usually exceptionally well-informed, and I assume that what has been written by various representatives of the press in the quotations I have read has been based largely on factual knowledge.

Mr. President, I wish either Mr. Hoover or Mr. Roosevelt would walk out on the street and talk to any 10 American citizens on this question, and I think they would find that 10 out of the 10 are opposed to transferring to the backs of the American taxpayers these enormous debts due from Europe to the American people. There is no question in the world but that they are taxed to death now—the farmers of the country, the small property owners, and the people generally—and here now again the whole thing is to be reopened. We are to have more negotiations about these debts, when, as has been stated time and again on this floor, and no one will controvert the statement, the debtor nations have had the debts canceled already, completely and more, to overflowing. All in the world the Debt Funding Commission has asked them to do is to pay the interest over a period of 62 years; and that interest will be less than 4 per cent, while the American taxpayer must pay the debts twice if they are transferred back to his shoulders. He must pay the 4 per cent interest on the bonds and he must pay the principal as well.

Apparently our statesmen, especially in executive office and those who are to be in executive office, have far more regard for Europe and Europe's welfare than for the welfare of the American people, sorely overburdened as they are at the moment, to say nothing of the economic distress that exists all over the land. We still owe more than \$20,000,-

000,000 of this bonded indebtedness in principal, all of which must be paid.

Mr. President, it seems to me that statements of this kind coming from both the outgoing President and the incoming President are not only disconcerting to the American people, but they must be positively startling.

I wish Mr. Roosevelt, so far as he is concerned—and he has my best wishes; God knows I want the country to get out of this depression at the earliest possible moment, because the situation is almost as grave as it possibly could be—but I wish Mr. Roosevelt, coming into the Presidency on March 4, would concentrate his intellect and his powers of thinking and all his faculties on how to remedy the situation for the American people and forget about Europe and the rest of the world for a moment, and try to solve some of the problems we have confronting us here. I think that sort of concentration is the thing that the American people are looking forward to.

I do not seem to have at hand the exact wording of the statement given out, but I suppose it is not necessary to read it. The gist of it all has been given in what I have said before. The joint statement issued by the incoming President and the outgoing President, or in their names, was to the effect that the representatives of Great Britain had been invited here; and, of course, that is confirmed in what was said before.

I note, too, Mr. President—though I shall not take the time to read what has been said—that the debtor nations generally and in their press are quoted as being immensely pleased with the result of these conferences between these two distinguished American citizens—one the present Chief Executive and the other to come into that high office on March 4.

Mr. President, I submit that the Congress of the United States ought to protest against this usurpation of authority, because that is unquestionably what it is. The authority belongs to Congress to declare this policy. Congress has spoken, definitely and positively; and there should be no attempt on the part of anybody to set aside that policy, which has been so thoroughly and emphatically stated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, with many of the statements made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] during the course of his speech yesterday I am in sympathy. I do not feel, however, that the address delivered by him this morning is just; and for that reason exception to some of his statements is taken.

He has declared that it is a usurpation of authority for the President, or the President elect acting in anticipation of his coming into responsibility, to discuss a question with a foreign nation at the request of that government.

So far as I can recall, there never has been an instance when a courteous application for the discussion of an international question, or of a question that involves international relations, has been made by one government to another that it has been denied.

With respect to the declaration that it is a usurpation of authority by the President, let me point out to the Senator from Indiana what, in his less agitated moments, he must know and recognize to be the fact:

The President, under the Constitution, is charged with the responsibility of conducting foreign relations; and under that power he can discuss, or for that matter negotiate, with every recognized government. So that it is an erroneous statement of fact, not to say a misrepresentation, for the Senator from Indiana to assert that in complying with the request of the British Government for a discussion of the subject of war debts the President is usurping authority.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is perfectly proper. The American Government can discuss any question with a foreign government; but I submit to the Senator from

Arkansas—for whom I have the highest personal regard, as he well knows—that we have all the machinery for that sort of negotiation. We have an ambassador at the Court of St. James. They have an ambassador here. We have embassies or legations in the capitals of all of these debtor nations; and those negotiations should be conducted through the regular channels.

I understood at one time that that was the position taken by the President elect, which position seems to have been changed; nor should I quarrel with that. It is perfectly proper for negotiations to be conducted from time to time between governments. What I object to is the proposition of reopening the whole debt question when Congress says it has been closed, and having representatives come from those countries to this country for the purpose of reopening these negotiations. Everybody in the world knows that as soon as they are reopened it means reduction or cancellation, or both, and that is the whole purpose of reopening negotiations.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the admission made by the Senator from Indiana that it is not a usurpation of authority on the part of the President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have not made that admission.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Well, Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to use a little of my own time? I say that he did make that admission. He said that he has no objection and recognizes the right of the Executive to conduct negotiations or discussions; but he insists upon imposing on the Executive his view as to the agencies or the manner of the discussion. That is a mere matter of detail.

I am inclined myself to believe that the diplomatic agencies are adequate for the discussion of questions that may arise on this subject; but I am not intrusted with the responsibility of determining that question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does not the Senator, then, agree with me that since Congress has spoken and declared its policy on this very question, the Executive should have said to the representatives of these debtor nations, "The door is closed. Congress, which has the sole authority to close the door, has closed it. There is nothing to negotiate"?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, if that question were asked from a less respectable source, I would answer it in a manner different from the way in which I am going to answer it.

Why, Mr. President, certainly Congress can not foreclose the right of the President to discuss international questions. Certainly Congress can not prevent the President from negotiating on an international question.

I am in sympathy with the decision made by the Congress. I am in sympathy with the attitude taken by the Congress in its joint resolution respecting the subject of the payment or collection of war debts; but I do not approve an assertion that Congress is the only body that can negotiate about or discuss these questions. Indeed, Congress has no power in that particular.

I point out to the Senator from Indiana that before any arrangement can go into effect—if a new arrangement were to be proposed—it must either be ratified as a treaty by the Senate, or approved by the Congress in the exercise of its legislative authority.

Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is playing cheap politics. He has not raised an issue in the interest of the American people as I conceive it. He is attempting to do the small thing of trying to arouse prejudice against the present President and against the incoming President, who, for reason, are cooperating, in a measure, on this subject; and that is not an exalted course to pursue.

In the conduct of international relations it has been the policy of most public men to abstain from partisan action. It is entirely true that political parties have adopted plat-

forms having relation to international issues, and it is proper that they shall do so. The Democratic Party, in its last platform, adopted a plank on this subject. The Republican Party was strangely silent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. I do not care what the Democratic Party and the Republican Party have adopted; is it not pretty well conceded that under the economic conditions now prevailing the countries can not discharge these obligations?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is contended by the British Government and by other governments that they can not meet their obligations according to the terms of their contracts, and they have asked us to hear them on that question. The Senator from Indiana would have the President of the United States, whether he be a Democrat or Republican, refuse the courtesy of a hearing. It will be time enough for the Senator from Indiana to offer criticism when the Executive authority presents to the Congress its treaty or its recommendation, if the Executive shall take that course.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It will be entirely too late then. The damage will all have been done. The reduction and the cancellation will be accomplished.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I repeat, the Senator from Indiana has no right to assume that, because courteous consideration is extended to the British Government upon its request in connection with these debts, some effort is being made to do injustice to our own people. It would be an act of gross discourtesy to refuse the request of the British Government. I think the British Government is entitled to a hearing.

I recall that the British Government got the worst of the bargain when these debt settlements were being made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to another question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the Senator think the British are less able to pay than the American people now are?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That question has no relationship whatever to the subject I am discussing, and the Senator from Indiana must know that. I repeat the statement, that when a friendly government asks my Government to discuss an international question, I do not care who is President or what narrow-minded Senator objects, I am willing to extend that courtesy and take my share of the criticism that is involved in extending it.

The British Government had the worst of the bargain in the debt settlements, and if, while she is going forward meeting her obligation, and other governments better able to pay than she are refusing to meet their obligations, she asks for a discussion of the question as it affects her, it is inconceivable to me that any patriotic American would make politics out of it when the attempt is made to accord her reasonable consideration.

I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I thought—and it seems to me now—that the remarks this morning of the Senator from Indiana were calculated to create an erroneous impression, and to reflect themselves in prejudice. We may entertain all the prejudice we please against the British Government, but the British people are a great people. They are a courageous people. They have during the last 150 years had a great ruling group. It would be exceedingly unfortunate, in my judgment, if the Congress of the United States should place itself in an attitude of denying fair consideration to existing conditions and to questions and issues which the British Government asks the liberty of presenting to this Government.

I can conceive that a nation in default, admittedly able to pay, stands upon an entirely different basis. As far as I am concerned, that fact shall be kept in mind when an arrangement of readjustment is presented to the Senate for consideration and action, if any shall be presented.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I have located the statement as to the White House conference as it was printed in this morning's edition of the New York Times. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the statement? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT ON WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Following to-day's conference between President Hoover and President-elect Roosevelt this statement was issued at the White House:

"The conference between the President and the President elect this morning was attended by Secretaries Stimson and Mills and Messrs. Norman Davis and Moley. The discussions were devoted mainly to a canvass of the foreign situation, and the following statement covering the procedure to be followed was agreed upon:

"The British Government has asked for a discussion of the debts. The incoming administration will be glad to receive their representative early in March for this purpose. It is, of course, necessary to discuss at the same time the world economic problems in which the United States and Great Britain are mutually interested, and, therefore, that representatives should also be sent to discuss ways and means for improving the world situation.

"It was settled that these arrangements will be taken up by the Secretary of State with the British Government."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I just wanted to make this brief rejoinder to the statement made by my good friend the Senator from Arkansas. I do not agree with him in the slightest degree that Great Britain got the worst of the deal. It is true, perhaps, that less favorable terms were accorded Great Britain than were accorded France and Italy.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. When I finish this statement. All the principal of the debt was canceled, so far as Great Britain was concerned, and only a little more than 3 per cent interest did she agree to pay, over a period of 62 years, while our people must pay 4 per cent, and more, throughout the years, as well as the principal. In the funding of the indebtedness we have canceled the principal for debtor nations. Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, what I intended to say was that, taking into consideration the arrangements effected with other borrowers, Great Britain got the worst of the bargain. I thought that was the plain import of my language. If it was not, I make the statement now.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That may be true; but, as far as the United States is concerned, Great Britain got the better of the bargain.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, let me point out that the joint statement submitted for the Record by the Senator from Indiana shows, as was stated during my former remarks, that a request had been received from the British Government.

Let me also point out this fact, that the time elapsing between March 4 and the date when the next payment will become due will be comparatively brief. I do not assume any authority to speak for President-elect Roosevelt, but I can see, as I think everyone who hears me can see, that it was probably necessary to proceed as soon as practicable after the inauguration of the new President in order that the hearing might be completed by the next date of maturity.

BANKING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4412) to provide for the safer and more effective use of the assets of Federal reserve banks and of national banking associations, to regulate interbank control, to prevent the undue diversion of funds into speculative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG obtained the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I renew the request for unanimous consent which I made a short time ago, namely, that at 15 minutes past 1 we vote upon the so-called Bratton amendment as perfected by the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that the Senator from Louisiana, in order to make this matter clear on the record, should withdraw his amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. I withdraw for the time being my proposed amendment to the Vandenberg amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request, if I may be recognized to make a brief statement showing to the Senate what the issue is.

Mr. LONG. I will yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be withdrawn, and the Senator from New Mexico offers the amendment which will be reported.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, before it is offered formally, I desire to perfect it in three respects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been formally offered, so the Senator may perfect it.

Mr. BRATTON. In line 1, after the word "may," I modify the amendment by inserting the language "with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency." In line 5, I strike out the word "permitted" and insert in lieu thereof the words "expressly authorized." In line 6, I strike out the period and insert this language, "and subject to the restrictions as to location imposed by the law of the State on State banks."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the modified amendment will be considered as pending, and the unanimous-consent agreement submitted by the Senator from Montana is entered into.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, complying with a request just made to me by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPENLAND], I shall read the amendment thus perfected, so that the Senators may understand its contents. It would read as follows:

(c) A national banking association may, with the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, establish and operate new branches within the limits of the city, town, or village, or at any point within the State in which said association is situated, if such establishment and operation are at the time expressly authorized to State banks by the law of the State in question and subject to the restrictions as to location imposed by the law of the State on State banks. No such association shall establish a branch outside of the city, town, or village in which it is situated unless it has a paid-in and unimpaired capital stock of not less than \$500,000.

Mr. President, let me say in this connection that the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] joins me in submitting this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote will be had first on the Bratton amendment. Under the rules the vote should be taken first upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], but without objection, the vote will be taken on the Bratton amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, has the unanimous-consent agreement been entered into?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. The Chair stated the request, there was no objection, and the Chair stated that the unanimous-consent agreement had been entered into.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the agreement to vote has been entered into, I shall ask

to proceed without interruption. I welcome this belated anxiety for speed. It is about 10 days late.

The issue before the Senate is now this: First, shall we have branch banking, under the Bratton amendment, limited to those States which affirmatively permit branch banking by State laws; or, second, shall we have a broader privilege of branch banking in respect to proven need and to geography, but a more limited privilege of branch banking in respect to institutional characteristics, as provided in my pending amendment.

Let me make it still plainer. My amendment, which has been pending since last May and which is now the alternative which the Senate may choose in respect to the Bratton amendment, provides that there shall be no branch bank anywhere except under two circumstances: First, in a community which has no banking facilities whatever—in other words, in a bankless community; second, in a community where some existing banking facility is taken over.

The obvious purpose of my amendment is to permit branch banking and limit it to those situations where there is a clear public need for it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can not yield because I am proceeding under limitation of time. I repeat that my amendment would prescribe branch banking only in situations clothed with clear public need.

That public necessity exists under the terms of my amendment either in a community which is calculated never to have any banking facilities except it be proper branch facilities, or in a community where in practice an existing banking unit is calculated to fail and close its doors except as it may associate itself in new branch relationships with some stronger institution. I submit that in both of those limited instances there ought to be a branch banking privilege, as a matter of sound public policy and in elementary defense of the right of bank depositors in the United States—and they are the only ones in whom I am interested. I submit that in these two instances the option of branch banking should exist in every State in the Union and not merely in a limited few.

Under the terms of the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] there can be no branch banking, not even in bankless communities, not even in communities where a branch might take over an existing unit and save it and save the money of its depositors except in a few States. Under the terms of the amendment now pending, submitted by the Senator from New Mexico, there can not be a branch bank even in circumstances of the utmost need and utility in any except nine States of the Union, namely, Arizona, California, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, and Virginia. Unless there be new affirmative legislation in each of the other 39 States of the Union, this particular banking resource to save depositors and to save communities is denied to 39 States of the Union. I decline to share any responsibility for refusing this option of relief over the larger and broader area. Such refusal invites needless banking tragedy. Let those participate in such malignant hospitality who will. But let the issue be clearly understood.

Mr. President, I submit that as between the two types of limitation and in the circumstances and situation in which the country finds itself at the present time, the limitation which I am proposing is infinitely more humane as well as infinitely more practical. What is to happen to the bankless community in the other 39 States? What is to happen in those 39 States when a situation exists in which an existing unit bank or affiliate could be taken over by a stronger parent institution and thus save the solvency of that bank for the benefit of its depositors and the community itself? Under my amendment these situations may be saved. What is to happen if we attach the Bratton amendment? Nothing is to happen in behalf of community life and in behalf of

depositors. Nothing is to happen because the Senate, in its wisdom, proposes to decline what in many instances would and will be the only salvation.

The issue is perfectly clear, I submit, in choosing between the two alternative methods of limitation. I submit that under my pending amendment there can be none of the hazards of concentrated banking and credit control that we have heard so much about in the inflammatory declamations of the past fortnight. There does not exist within the limitations of my amendment any remote jeopardy of the nature we have heard discussed here by the hour and by the week in the belligerent debate upon this bill. There can be no such concentration whatsoever under the terms of my amendment, an amendment which long ago the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, conceded was an advantage and willingly approved and accepted.

So here is the choice. The choice is between two types of limiting branch banking. On the one hand, if we vote for the Bratton amendment we vote a geographical limit which prohibits branch banking under any circumstances, no matter how much branch banking might be needed in a specific instance, in any State unless and until there is affirmative legislative action in the State itself.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. Is not the Senator permitted to offer an amendment to the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The issue is perfectly plainly drawn in the two amendments pending. I have no disposition to complicate the situation nor to prolong the discussion. No new amendment is needed in order to make the thing perfectly plain. I want to repeat how plain it is.

The Bratton amendment declines to permit branch banking in 39 States of the Union unless and until there is affirmative legislative action in those 39 States.

Mr. NORBECK. In other words, unless they want it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Unless they want it, perhaps too late, and until affirmative action is taken by the legislatures of those States. No matter how emergent the need, no matter how much grief and disaster might be saved by this recourse, we are asked to say that nothing of this healing sort shall happen unless each individual State individually legislates upon the subject. This would be indeed a timid permit scarcely worthy of these hazardous times.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that he is in error as to Wisconsin. I think the Senator said the Bratton proposal embraces States except, among others, Wisconsin. In that respect the Senator is in error.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The State of Wisconsin permits branch banking in the same city and the same location of a closed bank and permits stations with limited functions in places deprived of banking facilities in the same county. I can not go into the detail of each State, but, broadly speaking, I stand upon the statement I have made, because it is based, not upon any calculation of mine, but upon an official statement from Federal reserve sources. I stand upon the statement that as a broad proposition the Bratton amendment prohibits branch banking in a state-wide way in 39 States of the Union, except as there be affirmative State action to justify it. I stand upon the statement that this is virtually cloture, at least contingent cloture, upon broad banking relief in the United States; and I again repudiate the self-serving notion that any such cloture is necessary to protect us against the vice of banking concentrations. That protection amply exists within the terms of my own amendment, which is now alternatively available.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, am I to understand there has been a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this proposition at a quarter past 1 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GLASS. I am sorry that was done. If the Senator from Michigan will permit me to have a minute—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I want to repeat the statement I have made to the Senate on two separate occasions, that my own judgment is that section 19 of the bill as proposed to be amended by the Senator from Michigan should prevail. My judgment in that respect has not been altered in any degree. I also stated that I feel honorably committed to vote on that proposition before I could consent to any amendment of the bill in other respects. I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] understands that. But I have said and now repeat that in the event the Senate disagrees with that view, the so-called Bratton amendment as an alternative is acceptable to me rather than to continue this legislative escapade and defeat the very wholesome provisions of the bank bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand the Senator's position and I concur in it myself. If there can be nothing more evolved for the benefit of the depositor and the banking community than is contained in the short, sharp, devitalizing limitations of the Bratton amendment, I prefer that pathetically meager and inadequate crumb rather than to have nothing.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry I can not yield. I have only three minutes and I want to suggest the absence of a quorum before the vote is taken.

On the other hand, I want to make it plain, in conclusion, that the Bratton amendment is not the only possible limitation to be put upon branch banking to meet the view of those who fear serious banking concentrations. On the contrary, the amendment which I had the honor to offer, and which is still pending, is an even more drastic limitation in respect to the realities of the alleged menace from branch banking, because under the terms of the alternative amendment which the Senate can attach to the bill if it declines the Bratton amendment there will be no branch banking in any State except in the few instances where obviously the establishment of branch banking is clothed with absolute public necessity; and it is upon that basis that I ask the Senate to make its choice. Where the necessity exists, the Senate should not refuse to permit it to be served.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Costigan	Kean	Sheppard
Austin	Couzens	Kendrick	Shipstead
Bailey	Cutting	King	Smith
Barbour	Dale	La Follette	Smoot
Barkley	Davis	Lewis	Steiwer
Bingham	Dickinson	Logan	Swanson
Blaine	Fess	Long	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Fletcher	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Frazier	McNary	Trammell
Brookhart	George	Moses	Tydings
Broussard	Glass	Neely	Vandenberg
Bulkley	Glenn	Norbeck	Wagner
Bulow	Gore	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Byrnes	Grammer	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Hastings	Reynolds	Watson
Caraway	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Connally	Hebert	Robinson, Ind.	White
Coolidge	Howell	Russell	
Copeland	Johnson	Schuyler	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Hull], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Black], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Dill], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] are absent on official business, visiting Muscle Shoals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. COUZENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will not accept a slight change in his amendment.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COUZENS. Is it in order, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement, now to offer amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate would not be in order, but the Senator from South Dakota may ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will modify his amendment.

Mr. NORBECK. I should like to have the amendment I propose as a modification read at the desk, and I think the Senator from New Mexico will accept it. It applies only to States with small populations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order. The clerk will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That in States with a population of less than 1,000,000, and which have no cities located therein with a population exceeding 100,000, the capital shall be not less than \$250,000.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I have no objection to that.

Mr. NORBECK. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as suggested by the Senator from North Dakota. The question now is on the amendment, as modified, on which the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CARAWAY (when her name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. Hale]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HEBERT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. Dill]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stephens]. I understand if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I feel free to vote and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HASTINGS (after having voted in the negative). I find that on this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead], and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I was requested to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. Schall] and also to announce that, if present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Metcalf]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Pittman], and let my vote stand.

Mr. BULKLEY (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Carey], who is necessarily absent from the city. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. COPELAND. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. Wagner] is detained. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Keyes] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Black];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Townsend] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Hatfield] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison];

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Patterson] with the Senator from New York [Mr. Wagner];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Walcott] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Hull]; and

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Goldsborough] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hawes].

I am not advised how any of these Senators would vote on this question.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] is detained on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], if present, would vote "yea" on this amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (after having voted in the affirmative). I am advised that my general pair, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, would vote as I have voted, and therefore I let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—52

Ashurst	Coolidge	Kean	Robinson, Ark.
Bailey	Copeland	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.
Barbour	Costigan	King	Russell
Barkley	Cutting	La Follette	Schuyler
Blaine	Dale	Lewis	Sheppard
Borah	Davis	Logan	Shipstead
Bratton	Dickinson	Long	Smith
Brookhart	Frazier	McGill	Swanson
Broussard	George	Neely	Trammell
Bulow	Glass	Norbeck	Tydings
Byrnes	Gore	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	Hayden	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Howell	Reynolds	Wheeler

NAYS—17

Austin	Glenn	Smoot	Watson
Bingham	Grammer	Steinwer	White
Couzens	Johnson	Thomas, Idaho	
Fess	McNary	Thomas, Okla.	
Fletcher	Moses	Vandenberg	

NOT VOTING—27

Bankhead	Hale	Keyes	Schall
Black	Harrison	McKellar	Shortridge
Bulkeley	Hastings	Metcalf	Stephens
Caraway	Hatfield	Norris	Townsend
Carey	Hawes	Patterson	Wagner
Dill	Hebert	Pittman	Walcott
Goldsborough	Hull	Reed	

So Mr. BRATTON's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think that with the geographical limitation in place the other limitation would be inappropriate. I therefore ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan withdraws his amendment. The clerk will state the next amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, it seems to be understood that if this compromise amendment, to which I have repeatedly referred in the course of debate, should be adopted the filibuster against this banking bill would cease. How much of confidence may be placed in that seeming understanding I have no means of determining, because so many agreements and commitments have been made and violated that I am unable to determine what may now ensue.

I desire in a word or two again to make it plain, if in elaborate expositions of the bill I did not make it plain, that it was my considered judgment that the bill as drawn in section 19, with the severely restrictive amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], should meet the approval of the Senate, as I am sure it would meet the approval of the country.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GLASS. Not until I shall have completed my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. GLASS. I felt, however, from the beginning, as I have several times stated to the Senate, that there would be such bitter antagonism to that provision of the bill as that the bill itself would be endangered, and the many extremely important provisions of the proposed law would thus

fail, and that in consequence of that failure we would have another epidemic of bank failures.

I could have very earnestly wished that the parliamentary procedure here might have taken a course that would have enabled the Senate to vote first on section 19 as proposed to be amended by the junior Senator from Michigan, and upon what seemed to be the inevitable failure of that provision we should then have voted upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON], to which I have from time to time made reference. But freely admitting what undoubtedly is obvious without admission—that I have little knowledge of tactical parliamentary procedure—I do not seem to have been able to bring about that action by the Senate, and was shut up to voting for the Bratton amendment in order to test the sincerity and integrity of this alleged agreement to proceed promptly with the other provisions of the bill.

If I may now rely in any considerable measure upon this seeming agreement, I should be disposed to ask the Senate to recess now until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GLASS. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LONG. Not for a question; I want to make just a little statement, if the Senator would permit. I am sure the floor will not be taken away from him.

Mr. GLASS. I do not care to yield the floor. I will yield to the Senator for a brief statement.

Mr. LONG. I just want to say that I, of course, shall take suggestions and advice rather than undertake to suggest anything.

It is true that the backbone of the opposition to the Glass bill to some extent is broken, I might say; but the facts of the Bratton amendment are that the Senator from Virginia, in his reply to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] some days ago, stated that he in some senses favored it and in some senses did not; but, as reformed by the amendments of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], it was such as we could all carry along, whether it was quite all we wanted or not; and I had hoped that we might not have any review or historical reckoning of the few days that it has taken to reach this agreement. I do not see where it is going to do a great deal of good. I do not think it will help us in getting together and possibly carrying the bill hereafter.

I want to say, further, that when the Senator states that agreements have been violated, I am sure he does not refer to any agreement to which I was a party in the course of this debate.

EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I have had various appeals from Senators to recess for the balance of this day. In fact, I had been urged not to have the Senate convene today, but I thought we should proceed with the bill, and I contemplate making the motion in a little while to recess.

Before doing that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk a bill, and request immediate consideration of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (S. 5484) to extend the time during which certain provisions of the act of February 27, 1932, relating to improving the facilities of the Federal reserve system to meet the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, shall be effective, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 (b) of the Federal reserve act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VI, title 12, sec. 347b), and the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal reserve act, as amended by section 3 of the act entitled "An act to improve the facilities of the Federal reserve system for the service of commerce, industry, and agriculture, to provide means for meeting the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1932 (U. S. C., Supp. VI, title 12, sec. 412), are amended by striking out the date "March 3, 1933," wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 3, 1934."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I reserve the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma reserves the right to object. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield? While the Senator from Oklahoma is studying the bill which the Senator has just presented, may I inquire from him, from his knowledge of the amendments that are pending and from his contacts with Senators on the floor, whether he believes that there are many other controversial issues to be considered in connection with the pending bank bill before a final vote may be taken on its enactment.

Mr. GLASS. I could not answer that question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If there are not, it seems to me we ought to continue the business of this session and dispose of the bill to-day.

Mr. GLASS. I have been told that if we recess until Monday there will be no particular opposition to other provisions of the pending banking bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to take exception to that statement.

Mr. GLASS. How take exception to it—that I have not been told that that is so?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Not by me.

Mr. GLASS. I did not say I had been so told by the Senator from Oklahoma. I did not imagine that I would be by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have a reservation of objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia, which has been read?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to make a statement which will take but just a moment or two.

Last year, when the Glass-Steagall bill—have I the floor, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. GLASS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a brief statement, if he wants to make it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the floor, the Senator from Virginia having yielded.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, last year, when the Glass-Steagall bill was before this body, it contained a provision for one year that certain classes of securities could be placed as the basis for the issuance of currency. In an hour's speech upon this floor I moved to strike out that provision for one year and leave it indefinite.

After I had made my speech numerous Senators came to me and suggested that if I would modify my amendment to two years they would sustain my position. Yielding to those suggestions, I modified my amendment to make it for two years. On a roll call, over the objection of the Senator from Virginia, my position was sustained by about 40 to 20—about 2 to 1.

The bill thereby went to conference, and in conference, at the instance, I am advised, of the Senator from Virginia, the 1-year provision was placed back in the bill and it came back to the Senate. I was satisfied then in my mind that one year was too short, but not desiring to interfere unduly with the program of those who desire this legislation and at the request of the Senator from Virginia I yielded and let one year stand.

Now, Mr. President, in justification of my cause then and in support of my speech made one year ago the House has already passed a bill sustaining my position taken two years ago, and it is now proposing to extend the right one year further.

Let me call attention to the title of this bill:

To extend the time during which certain provisions of the act of February 27, 1932, relating to improving the facilities of the Federal reserve system to meet the need of member banks in exceptional circumstances shall be effective.

We are just going to have prosperity now for another year. They fixed it last year at one year. Times are worse to-day than they were a year ago, and now it is proposed to have prosperity under this bill for an additional year.

Mr. President, I am not against the bill; I was for it last year, but I was against the limitation of one year. Now I am against the limitation of one year for the future. If this bill is good, why not extend it indefinitely, and then, in the future, if we want to put a limitation upon it, Congress will be in session and can do so.

I do not care to take the time of the Senate, but I wanted to make this statement, notwithstanding the severe castigations I have had at the hands of the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to inquire of the Senator from Virginia the total amount of Federal reserve notes that are outstanding against the securities provided for in the Glass-Steagall bill of a year ago.

Mr. GLASS. I could not answer the Senator accurately without getting the figures from the Treasury. I know that under this particular provision of the bill the Federal reserve banks purchased approximately a billion dollars of Federal reserve bonds, and substituted a large proportion of the purchase for commercial paper.

Mr. BLAINE. Can the Senator give us information respecting the outstanding national-bank notes issued under the so-called Glass-Borah amendment of the home-loan bank bill?

Mr. GLASS. The last report had by me from the comptroller's office was that 800 banks, as I recall, had taken out additional circulation, to the amount, in the aggregate, of approximately \$150,000,000.

Mr. BLAINE. Does the Senator know approximately how that stands in comparison with the amount of Federal reserve notes that were issued under the Glass-Steagall bill? I do not mean to ask the Senator to give the exact amount.

Mr. GLASS. Federal reserve notes issued under the Glass bill?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; Federal reserve notes under the Glass-Steagall bill.

Mr. GLASS. I think the bond purchases were out of the assets of the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. BLAINE. They represent approximately what amount?

Mr. GLASS. I could not state that.

Mr. BLAINE. I have no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have the reports of the Federal reserve bank which are released weekly. On the 1st of January, 1932, more than a year ago, there was in circulation the sum of \$5,646,000,000. Notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Reserve Board bought \$1,100,000,000 of bonds, and paid for them with Federal reserve notes, which placed those notes in circulation, and notwithstanding the fact that 800 banks have increased their circulation by \$150,000,000 during the past 12 months, at the end of the year there was in circulation the sum of \$5,589,000,000, a decrease of \$57,000,000, notwithstanding over \$1,200,000,000 had been placed in circulation.

Mr. GLASS. Of course, Mr. President, it is not true that the Federal reserve banks issued \$1,000,000,000 of currency for their purchases of these bonds. As a matter of fact, they simply released practically that amount of reserve credit to the member banks, with the expectation that the member banks, with their reserve credits thus released, would respond to the requirements of commerce; and the member banks did nothing of the kind.

Mr. President, I do not care a thrip about this proposition. My judgment has not changed in the slightest degree about it. I stated a year ago, when the Glass-Steagall bill was before the Senate, that I thought it was a wretchedly bad policy, that it was taking us back to the old system of bond-secured currency, instead of to the flexible system of credits based upon commercial and industrial transactions.

I offered this bill at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. I am told that the Federal reserve bank directors are anxious to have it passed. The Senate may do as it pleases. I do not care a thrip about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED COTTON—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a few days ago there was laid before the Senate a conference report on House bill 13607, known as the Red Cross allotment of cotton bill.

A conference report is a privileged matter and may be brought up at any time. I do not know when this conference report was agreed to by the Senate; I did not happen to be on the floor at the time; but I understand that it was agreed to and that later the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which it was agreed to.

Since it is a privileged matter, being a conference report, and since there is very urgent need that the cotton covered by the measure be given to the Red Cross at the earliest possible time, I hope that the Senator from Utah will permit us to bring his motion up at once and see whether the Senate wishes to reconsider its vote on this privileged matter, in order that it may be decided without delay.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not ask to take up the matter at the present time. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] is interested in this matter and is necessarily absent from the city. He and I collaborated in the amendment, which was unanimously adopted in the Senate, the rejection of which by the conference committee has caused the delay in disposing of the bill in question. He is also interested in securing a reconsideration of the action of the Senate in adopting the conference report.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, this matter has been dragged along from day to day and from week to week. In the meantime there are people who are suffering and whose suffering could be alleviated by the Red Cross if this measure were enacted. It is not a matter of ordinary legislation; it is a matter of emergency. Repeatedly I have endeavored to get the legislation through. Repeatedly there have been delays occasioned by courtesies to absent Senators, and so forth, and it seems to me that we have come to the point where we ought not to be asked to delay the matter for three or four more days because a Senator is absent who presented an amendment which was adopted by the Senate but was thrown out in conference.

I was not one of the conferees, and know nothing of what took place in conference, but a unanimous report of the conferees was received. The report is a privileged matter. I desire to propound to the Chair a parliamentary inquiry, as to whether the privilege granted a conference report extends to all motions connected therewith, such as a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not believe it is a privileged matter, but that it should be brought up on motion, or by unanimous consent.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that he will make nothing by any attempt to railroad this report through in the absence of the Senator from Tennessee. If he insists upon taking it up, we shall be compelled to discuss the questions involved during the afternoon. Let me add that the delays referred to by the

Senator have been caused by the effort to pass a bill that contained improper provisions, and the action of the conference committee to utterly disregard the deliberate judgment of the Senate, as expressed in the amendment adopted by it.

I want to say to the Senator that I am getting rather tired of the procedure under which, after the Senate, following full discussion, unanimously adopts measures which go to conference, the action of the Senate is ignored.

This matter was discussed at the time the bill was before the Senate. And it was the unanimous view, so far as I could understand the attitude of the Senate, that no appropriation should be made from the Treasury of from ten to fifteen million dollars, to be added to the revolving fund of \$500,000,000, heretofore appropriated to the Farm Board. There was no objection to any measure that would credit the revolving fund with the value of the cotton, but there was objection to dipping into the Treasury of the United States for an indefinite sum, possibly \$15,000,000, to pay the charges and liens upon the cotton which was to be delivered to the Red Cross for proper distribution to the needy.

The Senator from Tennessee and I stated at the time that there was no objection to a measure which would credit the revolving fund with the value of the cotton, but there was objection to authorizing an indefinite sum to be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States to pay charges on liens upon cotton owned by the Farm Board or in which it had an equity.

The bill as it passed the House was not, in my judgment, fair, but the Senate amendment remedied the evil. The conferees, however, threw the amendment out without rhyme or reason, in my opinion, although I do not want to be critical, and, so far as I am advised, no effort was made to retain the amendment agreed to in the Senate.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator need not accuse me of trying to railroad this matter through. I have tried to bring it up repeatedly and have submitted to the desires of Senators and put it off from day to day. I was not a member of the conference and do not know what took place in conference. I do not see upon the floor at the present time any one of the conferees.

I hope that the Senator will not persist in his efforts to prevent the adoption of the conference report or vote upon it, no matter how strongly he feels in the matter. It seems to me that it is a question which should be decided without delay as to whether there is to be relief given this winter or not. Every day's delay means an additional day of suffering to a very large number of people.

The Senator knows that I have agreed with him in many points of view he has taken regarding the necessity of having the Federal Government relieve suffering, but it seems to me that in this case the Red Cross can be trusted to do its work well, and that this bill ought to be enacted at the earliest possible moment. It has passed both Houses, the House has agreed to the conference report, there was a unanimous report of the conferees, and I trust the Senator will not delay at least any further than Tuesday action on the report.

Mr. KING. I am willing that it shall be taken up Tuesday, when the Senator from Tennessee returns.

CONSTRUCTION CHARGES ON INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3675) relating to the deferment and adjustment of construction charges for the years 1931 and 1932 on Indian irrigation projects, which were, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of," to insert "such of the"; on the same page, line 5, after the word "charges," to insert "as are in default"; on the same page, line 9, to strike out "to the same extent" and insert "under the same terms"; and on the same page, line 9, to strike out the word "any" and insert the word "the."

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator the effect of the amendments to this rather important bill.

Mr. FRAZIER. As I understand it, they are to make the wording a little more simple. While the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is away, he being the author of the bill, his secretary informs me that he is satisfied with the amendments. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] makes the same statement.

Mr. KING. Let me inquire whether the bill imposes any additional burdens or obligations upon the Indians?

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not understand that it does.

Mr. KING. There has been so much legislation which in my opinion has been unfair to the Indians that whenever any measure comes before us dealing with them I want to be entirely satisfied that their rights are not injuriously affected.

Mr. FRAZIER. I understand the Senator's position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to agree to the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REPEAL OF EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, on yesterday I submitted a unanimous-consent request, and objection was made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. I understood thereafter that the Senator from Utah objected on the ground that appropriation bills were about ready or were ready for consideration at the conclusion of the disposal of the pending bank measure. Before submitting the unanimous-consent request again, I want to assure the Senator from Utah that, if the request is granted, at any time the Senator or those having charge of any appropriation bill desire to take up such measure for consideration, I will consent that the joint resolution shall be laid aside temporarily.

Therefore, I submit the unanimous-consent request that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—that is, the repeal of the eighteenth amendment—being Calendar No. 1111, be made a special order of business upon the conclusion of the consideration of the pending bank measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I want it distinctly understood that whenever there is an appropriation bill or a conference report on an appropriation bill ready for consideration the unanimous consent shall not interfere with the consideration or passage of those matters.

Mr. BLAINE. I can give the Senator that assurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

BANKING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4412) to provide for the safer and more effective use of the assets of Federal reserve banks and of national banking associations, to regulate interbank control, to prevent the undue diversion of funds into speculative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to move a recess with any misunderstanding. I did say to him a moment ago that I thought if we would adjourn until Monday we would facilitate the passage of the bill and he would have probably not very much opposition. I could only speak for myself. However, I have other amendments which I had expected would not be so bitterly contested, particularly the one putting the Secretary of the Treasury back on the Federal Reserve Board, as to which I understand there is not very much contest.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a few moments ago I expressed regret that the Senate was apparently about to take a recess until Monday at this early hour. In view of what transpired in the Senate during the past week, the resentment of the public, and in view of the further fact that the controversial question of branch banking is

now finished, I felt that we ought to show a disposition to get down to business and proceed to the disposal of the remaining pending amendments and vote on the question of enacting the bill. However, I have every confidence in the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I believe he is desirous of expediting action upon his bill. I do not want to assume to advise or influence his management of this bill through its parliamentary stages. Upon his statement that, in his opinion, definite and more prompt action will be obtained on Monday if we recess this afternoon, I shall make no objection.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator also that all of the time of the junior Senator from Virginia has been so occupied with this bit of controversy here that he has had no time to consider thoroughly such other amendments as have been proposed. I would like to have sufficient time to consider them.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In view of that fact I am sure that all of the Senator's colleagues will agree that he should have that time.

RECESS

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) took a recess until Monday, January 23, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21 (legislative day of January 10), 1933

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Maj. Leonard Craig Sparks, Field Artillery, from January 14, 1933.

TO BE MAJOR

Capt. Mark Wayne Clark, Infantry, from January 14, 1933.

TO BE CAPTAINS

First Lieut. William Andrew Smith, Infantry, from January 14, 1933.

First Lieut. Roy William Camblin, Air Corps, from January 14, 1933.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Second Lieut. James Wilson Green, jr., Signal Corps, from January 14, 1933.

Second Lieut. Farmer Wiley Edwards, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 14, 1933.

APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICER

To be brigadier general, reserve

Brig. Gen. Edward Moses Stayton, Missouri National Guard, from January 20, 1933.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, in the name of Him whose character has never suffered a blemish, whose earthly life has never been dimmed by the shades of time, and whose love touches a world of mortals we pray. In Him is light and in that light there is no darkness. Hear us, dear Lord. If threatened with misfortune, if overtaken by tribulation, may they be dispersed by the love and the power of Him who is our Saviour. Let us confidently be true to Thee, to ourselves, and to our country. May we never surrender to the breath of false ambition, greed, or appetite. To-day inspire us to approach all problems with conviction, understanding, and with abounding courage. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma."

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The SPEAKER. The Chair takes the privilege of laying before the House a resolution extending the time for reporting by the special committee investigating Government competition with private enterprise. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 360

Resolved, That the special committee appointed pursuant to the authority of House Resolution 235 for the purpose of investigating Government competition with private enterprise shall report to the House not later than February 8, 1933, in lieu of January 25, 1933, the date specified in House Resolution 312.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a resolution again extending the time for this committee to report?

Mr. SHANNON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. It does not include any additional expense, but simply grants additional time for this committee to make its report?

The SPEAKER. So the Chair is advised.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri a question? I have been getting numerous requests for the printed hearings of this committee, which I understand have not been printed. Are they going to be printed soon?

Mr. SHANNON. We are figuring on that.

Mr. BLANTON. If the work is going to be worth anything, I should think the hearings ought to be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 361

Resolved, That MARTIN DIES, of the State of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I frequently wonder if Members of Congress, including myself, are not, in the language of the street, "too near the elephant to see the circus." The crying need of the country to-day is relief for unemployment. The measures of national importance which we hear discussed from day to day and which are consuming the time of the Members of Congress have this in mind indirectly, and as a consequence of legislation which is discussed; but only indirectly, it seems to me, are we grappling with this vital problem.

For instance, in the farm-allotment plan the theory is that this will increase the purchasing power of the farmer, which will in turn increase production of manufactured articles, and as an indirect consequence increase employment. It may or may not accomplish this result, but it is entirely possible that the fear of this unusual legislation

in the business and industrial world will cause even more unemployment than it will stimulate.

The Government, as such, by expenditures from the Treasury can not possibly make a real impression on the millions of unemployed throughout the country. This can only be provided for by the return to safe and sound conditions with confidence throughout the country restored; and confidence can not return in the crisis through which we are passing with the papers full daily of measures such as the farm-allotment plan, measures to inflate the currency, measures to enormously increase the burden of taxation, with no one knowing where the burden will fall.

There are three primary objectives which I believe should consume the attention of Congress to the exclusion of all others until they are disposed of; and in my opinion with these three objectives obtained the country will itself revive and take care of the unemployment problem, which will in turn cure most of the distress from which we are now suffering.

BALANCE THE BUDGET

The first and most vital end to be obtained is to reduce Government expenses to a point where increased taxes will not be necessary and the Budget will be balanced. This can not possibly be done out of the normal operating functions of the Government, as this only amounts to a little over \$600,000,000 a year; and if this entire amount were saved, it would not be sufficient to balance the Budget without increased taxes; and, of course, the necessary functions of Government have to continue, though, of course, there could be substantial savings even in this item.

There are other expenditures, however, which with courage and determination and a realization of the vital necessity of economy on the part of the Members of Congress could be reduced along with whatever savings could be made in normal Government operations, which would balance the Budget without the necessity for additional taxes. It may take the power of a dictator to bring this about on account of the difficulty of getting the Members of Congress who are sincerely impressed with the importance of the different items to agree where the cut should come. Probably every individual Member, if he had exclusive authority, could balance the Budget to suit himself; but this would probably not suit a great majority of Members. However, this does not change the principle; and I believe that every Member of Congress will agree, and certainly the country believes, that the first and most vital move which this Congress could make is to balance the Budget by reducing expenses to the point where increased taxes will not be necessary.

This being done, business would again recover, confidence would be restored, and the great channels of trade and industry would quickly absorb many times more of the unemployed than the Government could possibly do by any measures of artificial respiration.

SHORTEN HOURS OF LABOR

The second vital aid which this Congress could render, in my opinion, to the unemployed is the immediate passage of a measure limiting the shipment in interstate commerce of goods manufactured or produced by labor to those articles in which labor was employed not in excess of five days a week and possibly six hours a day. This may seem a radical change from the past which we have been accustomed to, but it is not more radical and probably very much less disturbing than many of the artificial measures which are being enthusiastically supported at the present session.

I do not believe that all of the loss should fall on labor for these shortened hours, but that a real substantial contribution should be made from capital out of profits to labor in consideration of the shorter hours. If this would bring recovery, as I believe it would, both capital and labor would profit in the end; and everyone must realize that we can not continue the present system without real and material relief being granted.

This Congress will not have time in the remaining days of this session to pass the great number of bills which are earnestly and sincerely insisted upon by their proponents, but if the attention of Congress were focused on the two

above measures, this legislation could be completed and enacted before the end of the present session.

The dangerous trend, as I see it to-day, is that our great National Government is being required by insistent demands of different groups to assume the functions of a town council responsive to the wishes of the individual townsmen. In the prevailing chaos it seems to me that the time has come for Members of Congress to focus their attention on a few vital measures in keeping with the functions of the National Government to the end that confidence be restored. After seeing the effect of these between the adjournment of this Congress and the meeting of the next regular session, the country would have time to recover and the next Congress would be in a better position to appraise the conditions existing at that time, and my firm belief is that if the above two measures were enacted that many of the measures now earnestly advocated would not be necessary in December.

TAX MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES

In order to relieve the farms as well as city property from the distressing foreclosures which are disorganizing the entire country I would suggest a tax, either by stamp or otherwise, of 10 per cent on the face value of every mortgage bond foreclosed, the tax to apply on the day of foreclosure and before sale is permitted. I would limit this to one year, so as not to encourage defaults in those able to pay but to give the debtor class a breathing spell in the present emergency.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] for this purpose without having consulted the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], for the reason that the gentleman probably has a question of personal privilege, and would be entitled to the floor for one hour, anyway.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a Washington newspaper, the Daily News of January 20, has a brief article under these headlines:

Magic words fool House into passing an amendment. Legislators chagrined after adopting change offered by crippled Member which may cost them votes.

The matter referred to is an amendment to the pending appropriation bill offered in good faith, discussed both pro and con, and adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

How anyone could have misinterpreted or misunderstood the amendment, except possibly the gentleman who wrote this article, I am at a loss to understand.

In presenting the motion I stated:

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to let the present law remain as it is. As reported in this bill, it pays officers of the Corps of Engineers engaged in river and harbor work out of the Regular Army appropriation, when the law provides it shall be paid out of the lump-sum appropriations appropriated for river and harbor work.

An attempt was made to put this in last year and it was stricken out in the Senate. It now comes in again. I have the law here for previous years, and that law reads exactly as this will read if my amendment is adopted.

There are certain civilian engineers engaged in this same service. They are paid out of the rivers and harbors appropriation. If this bill passes as it is reported, it will divide up this money, and a portion of it will be paid out of one fund and a portion paid out of another fund, and yet it goes to identically the same purpose. The consequence will be that whenever you want to know how much money is being expended for river and harbor purposes you must go to the War Department and two or three different lines of clerks and divisions and bureaus to have them check it up and find out what it is. The only purpose is to have the present law remain as it has been for many years and let every tub stand on its own bottom.

I do not see how anyone could have misinterpreted or misunderstood the amendment. I have here several former appropriation bills, reading just exactly as this bill reads since the amendment I offered was adopted and placed in it.

For the information of the House I may state that prior to the year 1911 the engineers engaged in river and harbor works, then few in number comparatively, were paid out of the Regular Army appropriation bill. In that year the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs reported a bill to this House providing that the salaries of the Army engineers engaged in river and harbor works might be paid out of the rivers and harbors fund instead of being paid from the Army fund. This bill passed the House, went to the Senate, and was favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate; but before it came to a vote in the Senate, this amendment was put on the river and harbor bill which was also pending in the Senate, and consequently was passed by the Senate. The amendment was accepted in conference.

Here is the original report of the conferees. The conferees of the House on that occasion were Mr. Alexander, of Buffalo, N. Y., chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. Lawrence, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Sparkman, of Florida. They accepted the amendment, and it became law.

The appropriations have been carried on in this way ever since. This bill was passed in the House and reported in the Senate at the instance of the Committees on Military Affairs, the proper committees to deal with the matter. It was recommended by the Chief of Staff, it was recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and the report says it was endorsed by the President. There was no opposition to it, apparently, from any source, and I think myself it was wise and proper.

Now, it has been suggested that the purpose of my amendment was to deprive the rivers and harbors fund of \$227,490 by providing that the engineers should be paid out of rivers and harbors fund, as they have been heretofore, instead of paying them out of the Army fund. Suppose it does this. If it is right and proper for it to be done in this way, let it be paid in this way.

If the river and harbor legislation is not capable of standing on its own bottom, if the projects of the river and harbor bill are not meritorious enough for their expenses to be paid out of Government funds, the sooner they can be done away with the better it will be for the taxpayers and for Congress.

There has been a good deal of propaganda put out because of river and harbor matters. I have a copy of a speech made by the vice president of a railroad, in which he is criticizing General Ashburn, in charge of the Government barge line on the Mississippi River. He criticizes him very severely. He uses this language:

The president of the Government owned and operated competitor is receiving his salary and expenses, not from the Inland Waterway Corporation but directly from the public purse, the appropriations for the War Department.

I do not want them to have any such criticism against the river and harbor expenditures; but that is not all. There is a good deal of that kind of propaganda from other sources.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For a brief question.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will note that no reputable newspaper, such as the Washington Star or the New York Times, would have published such a misleading, unsportsmanlike statement; but this little undersized sheet in Washington that refers to our universally beloved colleague, the able and distinguished gentleman from Texas, as the crippled Congressman, ought to know that our friend is crippled only in his feet, while the undersized newspaper is crippled in its head. [Laughter]

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will place these facts in evidence and let the House judge for itself.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. SNELL. I have not taken any part in the argument, but I would like to know if I am correct in my understanding. It really makes no difference as far as the expenditures of the Government are concerned; this is merely a matter of bookkeeping; that is, whether it shall be charged to the rivers and harbors or the War Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is correct.

Now, here is another criticism of the Government barge line. It is from the Railway Age. It says that the salary of

the chief executive officer has been paid from the beginning by the War Department funds, and so on.

Now then, any measure of this kind that gets into the river and harbor legislation is nothing more nor less than a club to be placed in the hands of the enemies of the waterways improvements to beat us over the head with. The small amount of \$227,000 is too insignificant to allow anything of that kind to occur. Let us continue just as we have been doing since 1911. During this period our ports, Great Lakes, and inland waterways have been improved more extensively and systematically than ever before, and no one can truthfully accuse us of receiving money from the Treasury, except in a manner open and aboveboard.

Now, here is another speech from another railroad vice president. It criticizes General Ashburn again, and says that this president of the Waterways Corporation receives a salary amounting to \$9,700 per year, not from the Inland Waterways Corporation but directly from the public purse out of the appropriations for the Army and charged against the funds for national defense.

The \$227,000 is an insignificant sum, but with me it is the principle that is involved. I do not want any man in the United States, as far as I am concerned and as long as I have anything to do with river and harbor legislation, to be able to say that we are, as far as the appropriation of money is concerned, camouflaging or placing it under false pretences. I would rather do without it. The waterways have handled as much as \$26,000,000,000 worth of commerce a year; and if they are not able to stand on their own merits, let us stop and let the whole program go by default.

The railways, as you all know, are fighting river and harbor improvements now enormously. Here is a book issued two years ago by that authority. It must have cost many thousands of dollars. In this they have a great deal to say—it is too long to read—about the hidden costs in connection with river and harbor improvements and the operations of the barge line. Of course, I have nothing to do with the barge line. The barge line is not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. It is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, something with which those engaged in rivers and harbors legislation have had no connection.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. The barge line was simply established as an experiment and a demonstration to prove the feasibility of the navigation of the rivers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly, the gentleman is correct; purely for experimental and pioneering purposes.

Mr. GARBER. And it is now paying for itself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. And it will soon cease to operate further.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The amendment which my colleague placed on the bill was put on the War Department appropriation bill. The Committee on Appropriations is composed of 35 members, and those members are on the floor to protect their bill. Whenever a Member can put an amendment on a bill of that kind, the country can rest assured that it is a proper amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That suggestion, I believe, answers itself, and I am glad to have the gentleman's suggestion. I simply wanted to assure this House that, instead of trying to deceive the House as this newspaper states, my only purpose was to prevent the House from being deceived. I did not want any sum whatever to come to the legislation with which I have any connection under false pretences, or under circumstances by which it might be said that we were getting it under cover or in "hidden costs," as the language is used in all this railroad propaganda. I thank you. [Applause.]

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1934

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill

(H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the War Department appropriation bill, with Mr. DRIVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

HORSES, DRAFT AND PACK ANIMALS

For encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army, in cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, including the purchase of animals for breeding purposes and their maintenance, \$118,827.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds with that, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in the House for whom I have a higher personal regard than I have for the gentleman from Texas [Judge MANSFIELD]. I believe him to be one of the ablest and one of the most conscientious men in the House. However, I think he is entirely mistaken, in the main, about the matter which he has discussed in his speech this morning. Here is the law on the subject of the pay of Army officers engaged in river and harbor and flood-control activities:

Provided, That the officers of the Corps of Engineers when on duty under the Chief of Engineers connected solely with the work of river and harbor improvements may, while so employed, be paid their pay and commutation of quarters from the appropriations for the work or works upon which they are employed.

In other words, they may be paid from that appropriation or they may be paid from some other appropriation that may be available for such expenses. Last year, feeling as it does that all officers should be paid from one appropriation, the committee provided for the payment of all officers of the Army out of the one appropriation, "Pay of the Army." Therefore, we reduced the appropriation for rivers and harbors and flood control by the amount estimated for the pay of these men and for their allowance of commutation of quarters. I read from the report of the committee on the 1933 bill, reported to the House May 5, 1932, under the head "Rivers and Harbors":

It is true the bill shows a reduction of \$722,905. This amount is made up of a transfer of \$227,490 to "Pay of the Army," and \$495,415 to the single appropriation for traveling expenses.

In other words, the committee reduced river and harbor appropriations by \$227,490 and transferred that amount to "Pay of the Army"; but in the paying of these men, notwithstanding the fact that the House reduced the river and harbor appropriations by the amount I have stated, the War Department, despite such action by the Congress, is continuing to pay these men out of river and harbor appropriations. So, in order to prevent the will of the Congress being thwarted in such manner, the committee has provided under the appropriation for "Pay of the Army" for the pay of an average of so many officers, including all officers of the Corps of Engineers. So then, the effect of eliminating the language, which has been done at the instance of the gentleman from Texas, will be to keep the same amount of money in the bill for the pay of the Army but, on the other hand, makes it possible for these engineers to be paid from the river and harbor appropriations where no provision has been made for them, with the result that river and harbor appropriations, by the adoption of Judge MANSFIELD's amendment, have been reduced by \$227,490. That is the picture as it exists.

Mr. SNELL. And, as far as the pay of the individual Army officer is concerned, it makes no difference; he gets not a dollar more whichever way he is paid.

Mr. COLLINS. Absolutely not. The committee felt that all pay should be embraced in one item, so that the Congress may know and the public may know how much we appropriate for the pay of officers without having to consult many sources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHAPMAN: Page 23, line 20, after the word "animals" in line 19, strike out lines 20 to 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For the purchase of draft and pack animals and horses within limits as to age, sex, and size to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, for remounts, for officers entitled to public mounts, for the United States Military Academy, and for such other organizations and parts of the military service as may be required to be mounted, and for all expenses incident to such purchases, including \$118,827 for encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army, in cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, including the purchase of animals for breeding purposes, and their maintenance, \$201,327."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to add to the bill the sum of \$82,500 for the purchase of riding horses, pack horses, and mules for the Army. The Quartermaster General's Department asked for an additional appropriation for that purpose in the sum of \$220,875. That amount was recommended by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Thus it will be seen that we are asking by this amendment \$135,375 less than the recommendation of the Budget Bureau, because the sum asked for by this amendment is the exact amount that was appropriated last year for the purchase of horses and mules during the present fiscal year, to wit, \$82,500.

At the time we entered the World War we found a great need for horses and mules for the Army. A few years before nearly every farmer in the land had been a horse breeder and a horseman, but there had come a great diminution in the number of suitable horses. The production of good riding horses had decreased until in the face of war the situation was extremely critical. Soon after we entered the war it became necessary to purchase 320,000 horses and 160,000 mules. It was found that the vast majority of those animals did not have the requisite blood lines and that they had not been properly conditioned and trained. They were unfit for the rigors of war. The greatest military authorities estimate that in the unhappy event of another war our initial need would be 350,000 horses and 300,000 mules. According to the lowest reasonable estimate, the necessary replacement would be 3 per cent, or 19,500 per month, or nearly a quarter of a million a year. This is of great importance, not only to our national safety but also to augment the income of thousands of farmers in more than 40 States.

My friends, there are those who contend that horses and mules are no longer needed as a part of our national defense.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I would like to ask my colleague if there is a word of evidence in the hearing against the appropriation of the full item of \$220,000 asked for by the Budget?

Mr. CHAPMAN. No, sir. General De Witt, in his testimony, declared that there is a need for 861 riding horses, 207 draft horses, and 404 mules, costing \$220,875.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. No part of that \$220,000 is included in the bill, and the gentleman's amendment seeks to add \$82,500, the amount carried last year, or about \$130,000 less than the estimate of the Director of the Budget?

Mr. CHAPMAN. One hundred and thirty-eight thousand three hundred and seventy-five dollars less than the Budget estimates and the requirements of the Army, according to the testimony of the Quartermaster General.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Is this the item that was referred to yesterday by the gentleman's colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] when the gentleman attempted to lift \$150,000 or \$200,000 out of the appropriation for motor vehicles and put it into the purchase of horses and mules?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It is.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. And that vote was negative. This amount that the gentleman is seeking to have put in would then be an actual addition to this appropriation?

Mr. CHAPMAN. An addition of approximately \$82,000, but more than \$138,000 less than the Budget estimate.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order. The amendment is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. COLLINS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It is subject to a point of order, but I am not going to make the point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the reservation comes too late.

Mr. DOWELL. Well, I make the point of order. The gentleman has just withdrawn it.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The gentleman has withdrawn his point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. As long as the point of order was here I have a perfect right to rely upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the right to reserve the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. But I withdrew it because it is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be true, but that is a matter that will have to be decided later.

Mr. DOWELL. That is a matter for the Chair to decide, and not the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. As a matter of fact, this \$118,000 carried in the bill would be almost wasted unless the gentleman's amendment were adopted, would it not?

Mr. CHAPMAN. This would certainly add greatly to the importance and value of the \$118,827 appropriation for our national defense, according to all the testimony before the committee and the experience of those on whose shoulders rests the responsibility for the efficiency of our national defense.

Mr. GOSS. I do not see the object of putting that money into the bill for the encouragement of breeding if we are not going to buy some horses.

Mr. CHAPMAN. It is vital to the continued welfare of the Remount Service and its value as an instrument of national defense that we should adopt this amendment for the purchase of horses. I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut that the generosity of public-spirited, far-sighted, patriotic horsemen has greatly and materially diminished the cost of this service to our national defense. They have made donations of splendid horses at times in the past, aristocrats of the paddocks, amounting in value to some \$400,000. Citizens of the district which I have the honor to represent have given more than citizens of any other district in America. For example, that prince among sportsmen and great philanthropist, Col. E. R. Bradley, master of Idle Hour Farm, Lexington, Ky., the man who every year feeds the mouths and gladdens the hearts of more orphans than probably any other individual American, not long since gave to the Army Remount Service a horse of superb blood lines, a winner of the Kentucky Derby, the premier turf classic of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object, but we will not get through with this bill until next August the way we are going. I shall not object now, but from this time on I will object, because we ought to get through with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. COLTON. Is it not a fact that if the gentleman's amendment is not adopted many horses that have been grown by farmers with the thought that they would be purchased by the Army will not be sold, and this will be a great handicap and disappointment to the raisers of horses? It will discourage the raising of good horses.

Mr. CHAPMAN. That is absolutely true, because they have produced nearly 8,000 colts a year since 1921, at a total net cost of about one and a half million dollars. In the 12 years of its existence the Remount Service has been of untold benefit to the light-horse industry throughout America, not only producing thousands of suitable animals for our national defense in case of war but also proving a great boon to thousands of farmers and stock raisers in 40 States during a period of terrible depression in the agricultural and livestock industry. Not only is this amendment vital to national defense; but at this time, when throughout the land, and especially in this body, is being raised the hue and cry to help the farmer, surely we ought not to cut off these replacements.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Briefly.

Mr. BLANTON. The Army has demonstrated that it is doing away with our Cavalry horses and mechanizing the Army by moving Fort D. A. Russell away from the Big Bend country, the only place down there on the border where the United States needs any protection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I can not yield further in my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to a reasonable amount of mechanization, but the undisputed testimony of the highest military authorities is that Cavalry is as important in warfare now as it ever was in history. For instance, in the World War there were places where the surfaced roads ended and the mud began; where timbers had been felled and where shell craters yawned; where detours had to be made around barbed-wire entanglements; in the dead of winter when death lurked near, and American doughboys ready to go over the top and out into the death and destruction, into the hell of no man's land, waited anxiously in a dugout for food and ammunition and the satisfying "fag"—the motor vehicle was a failure. The horse and mule were indispensable. Countless times they saved the day.

Call to witness General Pershing and others among the highest authorities in the science of war. General Pershing said of the Army mule:

You can pack him, drive him, or ride him; you can starve him, beat him, and neglect him—you can do all sorts of things to him that you can not do to an automobile, and he will be there just as long as he has four legs to walk on.

As to airplanes, they are important in reconnaissance work; but in some kinds of weather, in some atmospheric conditions, they can not serve the purpose, and Cavalry is necessary. When you send an airplane over a wooded area, the pilot will report: "I did not see the enemy"; but, Mr. Chairman, when you send the Cavalry through the woods, they come back, and the commander reports: "The enemy is not in the woods." That is reliable information.

General Harbord said:

War demands more Cavalry than ever. Cavalry means horses in great quantity.

General Summerall said:

It is a fact that Cavalry is of far more importance than it ever has been.

The eminent Field Marshal Allenby declared:

I know for certain that no decisive victory has ever been won in the past without the help of Cavalry, and I am quite sure that

no decisive victory will ever be reached in the future without the help of Cavalry.

Mr. Chairman, if those who would destroy the Cavalry have their way, imagine, if you can, the statues of the military heroes of the future. Imagine, if you can, Grant, Sheridan, Sherman, and Thomas, "Rock of Chickamauga," whose equestrian statue adorns yonder Thomas Circle, riding in a rumble seat. Imagine, if you can, molded in heroic bronze, the majestic figures of the knightly Kentuckian, John Hunt Morgan; Fighting Joe Wheeler; Nathan Bedford Forrest, Marshal Ney of the Confederacy; the cavalier, the dashing J. E. B. Stuart; the stern, Cromwellian Stonewall Jackson, and the greatest soldier that ever spoke the English language, the grandest military chieftain that ever sheathed a stainless sword, the pure and peerless Robert E. Lee, not mounted on noble chargers, but presenting the appearance of motor-cycle patrolmen.

Mr. Chairman, those who have served with me in the Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, and Seventy-second Congresses can bear witness that I have been regular, that I have supported the Committee on Appropriations and the other committees of this House; but at this time I can not follow the leadership of those, however lofty their motives, and however exalted their patriotism, who would afflict this red-blooded Republic with the pernicious anemia of pacifism. Rather, should we in this crisis repair to the wise counsel of the Father of our Country who declared that one of the most effectual means of preserving peace is to be prepared for war.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment asks only a small portion of what the undisputed testimony of military authorities declares is needed; only a small portion of what the Bureau of the Budget recommended. General De Witt testified that a larger appropriation than this is needed for national security. No witness contradicts him, and I ask the Members of this House, as American Representatives, to vote with us to insert this amount and to save the Cavalry of the American Army. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, as stated by the gentleman from Kentucky, there is not one penny of appropriation provided by this bill for the Cavalry, as I undertook to show yesterday. There is, as evidenced by the report on page 13, \$441,500 more for motor transportation than there was in the appropriation of last year; but not one cent for the purchase of horses, although the Quartermaster General, and I believe I am correct in saying the Director of the Budget, too, made a recommendation of \$220,000 for the purchase of additional horses and mules.

If we do not make this appropriation, what is the use, as suggested by the gentleman from Connecticut, of all this breeding and the encouragement to farmers and ranchers in more than 40 States to avail themselves of these breeding privileges if we do not provide a market for the animals; and if the farmer ever needed to have a market for his livestock, it is now.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Is the amount that is asked for to be used just for the annual replacement of necessary animals of the Army?

Mr. THOMASON. That is true, as shown by the testimony of the Quartermaster General. It is to replace old, diseased, and condemned animals. The Army and the Budget recommended that \$220,000 be allocated for this particular purpose; but there is not one cent in this bill for it.

This is all on this phase of the question, but let me tell you something about the practical workings of this bill. I refer again to the unjustified abandonment of Fort D. A. Russell, at Marfa, Tex. It was until a few days ago the

only post on the Mexican border for about 500 miles east of El Paso. It was established there by the Army as a means of protection against raids like the Villa raid at Columbus and the Brite Ranch raid near Marfa, where Mexican revolutionists killed many American citizens.

Here is what happened: Just about a month ago it was reported to me that Fort D. A. Russell was to be abandoned. I made some investigation and confirmed the rumor. I immediately introduced a resolution in this House that there be a hearing by the Committee on Military Affairs to determine the wisdom, the justice, and the propriety of the arbitrary abandonment of this post.

The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee sent the resolution to the Secretary of War. I also wrote him a courteous letter, sending him a copy of the resolution and asking for a hearing on the matter before this long stretch of Mexican border was left unprotected; and I undertake to say that in times of peace, if there is any part of our country that needs protection, it is the Mexican border, reaching from San Diego, Calif., to Brownsville, Tex., a distance of about 2,100 miles.

The principal part of the reply from the War Department was to send the testimony before this subcommittee, and I will read you one or two sentences from the questions asked Gen. Guy V. Henry:

Mr. COLLINS. What effort is your branch of the Army making toward mechanization, General?

General HENRY. We are making a serious effort to completely mechanize one regiment with the view of using it for experimentation and in developing tactics and technique for use in the mechanization of the Cavalry.

Mr. COLLINS. Are you aware of the fact that an order was gotten out yesterday to move those troops on January 1?

General HENRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. That was since these hearings began and since the committee has been asking questions as to why they have not been moved.

General HENRY. The War Department for a long time has been intending to move them.

Mr. COLLINS. The order issued yesterday was an immediate removal order, was it not?

General HENRY. It was an order for them to move on January 1.

Mr. COLLINS. It was more or less of an extraordinary order, was it not?

General HENRY. I do not think so, although I can not answer that question definitely.

Now, without a hearing before the Military Affairs Committee or any other committee, and without the approval of Congress, this post that the taxpayers of this country had spent a million dollars on in the last five or six years was abandoned and these troops were sent 2,500 miles to Kentucky to become mechanized.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness there ought to be some policy determined about this matter. It is an old saying that money talks. The committee refuses to appropriate a single dollar to buy horses and mules, but includes several hundred thousand dollars to motorize and mechanize the Army. I admit it is an effective way to completely change our military policy. The Cavalry is indispensable on the Mexican border. Airplanes can not locate the enemy when they hide in the hills, arroyos, and desert of the Mexican border. Motor trucks and vehicles can not travel off the good roads, which are few in that country. Cavalry is the only part of the Army that can get over the country and hold it after it is once taken. It was an outrage on national defense and the taxpayers that Fort D. A. Russell was abandoned in any such manner.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, there will not be any shortage of horses in the Army. This estimate is built up on an authorization of 17,929 horses. If we do not buy any horses, we will have on hand at the end of the next fiscal year, assuming 10 per cent of those we have on hand now will die or be destroyed, and this is the figure that the War Department gave us, 17,447 horses, which include 1,884 private mounts; and a private mount is in effect but another way of designating a public animal. It has cost us more to maintain a private mount than to maintain a horse owned by the Government, because it has been customary to give the officer owning it \$150 a year, and added to that

was the cost of the feed, the housing, the bedding, the shoeing, and so on. So the figures I have given indicate an apparent shortage of 482 animals, but they do not take into account animals that will be purchased out of revenues derived from the sale of horses to officers or to other departments of the Government. One hundred will be so acquired this year. In addition, 97 horses are assigned to the Air Corps, and the Chief of the Air Corps says he does not want them. This brings the shortage down to 285 horses.

Now, on page 22 of the bill, we give to the Army the privilege of substituting motor equipment for horses. The same as we have done for the National Guard. If that is availed of, we will find ourselves at the close of the next fiscal year not with a shortage but a surplus. There are 32 National Guard horse-drawn Field Artillery regiments to be motorized, which will render surplus 150 horses per regiment, or a total of 4,800. Such of these as are suitable will be available to the Regular Army.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I can not yield, because I have to go on.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS. So there alone we have 4,800 horses to cover this apparent shortage of 285 horses. We will have more horses than we will know what to do with.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I am very sorry, but I can not yield.

Just to illustrate to what length people are going in this War Department appropriation bill and labeling everything military defense, let me read you this letter:

It has been brought to my attention that you are opposing any appropriation for the United States Army for continuing its present animal strength and that you are advocating motorization.

I protest such a course because it will ultimately lead to a cessation of forage purchases from the South. At this time all purchases for the forage used in the southeastern corps area are made almost entirely from southern farmers. Are you aware of the aid this has been to southern farmers and the great harm that will result in motorization? Motorization has not been tried out. It might result in less expense of operation. I seriously doubt it. I hope you can see your way clear to look after our interests. Yours very truly—

And so forth.

Now, my friends, are we going seriously to build up military defense or are we going to turn this bill into a grab bag and let each and every one of us grab off one little piece and another little piece, and so on?

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I am sorry I can not yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. I would like the gentleman to give the committee some information.

Mr. COLLINS. Later on I shall yield. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, and I am speaking in the utmost good humor, let us not fool ourselves. Let us go along and provide for this country the very utmost of military preparedness and do it within reasonable budgetary limitations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] insist upon his point of order?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not press the point of order.

The point of order was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLLINS) there were 51 ayes and 31 noes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. COLLINS and Mr. CHAPMAN.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 76 ayes and 41 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes on a matter pertaining to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to a situation which I believe is a most brazen abuse of power on the part of the War Department. After I finish I am going to make a unanimous-consent request to return to page 11, line 11, and offer this amendment.

Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay and allowance of any commissioned officer convicted of murder, which conviction has been confirmed by an appellate court.

Now, that is a most startling amendment, and yet there is a commissioned officer on the active list—he was on the active list yesterday, who was charged with murder of his wife in 1929; he was indicted on the 18th of April, 1930, was tried and convicted by a jury on the 22d day of December, 1930, took over two years to perfect his appeal, and the conviction was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals on January 9, 1933. With the exception of the time that he was on trial he has been out on bail. After conviction he was allowed to remain at large on \$20,000 bail. After affirmation of the conviction by the circuit court of appeals his bail was continued, and I am informed that he is going to be permitted to remain on active duty until “every possible means of appeal has been exhausted.”

Now, he may ask for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court, but he has no appeal there as a matter of right. In fact the opportunity of appeal will not be granted in a case like this unless a constitutional question is involved. The law on murder has been upheld for many centuries.

Mr. BLANTON. The electric chair will take him off the list.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. He is sentenced to life imprisonment. It is the custom where an official of the Government is indicted to suspend him. There is some question whether or not they should wait until final conviction. In this case the officer has passed the conviction stage. The conviction has been affirmed by the circuit court of appeals, and I submit that it is not conducive to the morale and the good discipline of the Army for this officer to remain on the active list and on active duty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know nothing about the facts of the case, but this man is an officer of the Army of the United States charged with a grievous crime. Does not the gentleman think that the officer, as a citizen, has a right to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States if he believes that he has been deprived of some constitutional right?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We can not deprive him of that right and I do not intend to; certainly my amendment does not do that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman says that the court of appeals has affirmed the conviction, but I would hesitate somewhat to deprive an officer of the Army of his constitutional right to be convicted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. First of all, he can not appeal to the Supreme Court as a matter of right, as the gentleman knows. In this case the right of appeal has been exhausted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If he has not, that should end the matter.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. All he can do is to come up by certiorari and petition for an appeal. I would not take that right from him; but does the gentleman believe that he ought to be carried on the active list in the Army under the circumstances? If he were an enlisted man, he would not, under the same circumstances, be on active duty. That happens every day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What do the regulations provide?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I assume the matter is under the control of the Secretary of War. Why, murder is a military offense just as much as a civil offense. The officer could

have at least been suspended, after conviction of murder, for “conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman.”

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, I have no disposition to protect this man; I know nothing about him.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I know nothing about him other than his criminal conviction, now a matter of record. He has had his day in court. He should not be continued on the active list of the Army.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. At least this doctor should not be in the position of giving medical services to disabled soldiers or to soldiers of the Regular Establishment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Not if he uses iodine and strychnine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 11, line 11, to consider the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to return to page 11, line 11, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be first reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 11, line 11, add the following: “*Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay and allowances of any commissioned officer convicted of murder, and which conviction has been confirmed by an appellate court.”

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BALDRIGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. Is there not some explanation that the War Department has for this unusual situation? This is a question of administration and not a question of legislation. Certainly the War Department must have some explanation for an unusual situation like this. Why should we put this in the Army bill when it is a question merely of administration?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is not; but I want to make it clear that I am making no effort at all to cut off this man's right of appeal. All he can do now is to petition by certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States. That is always being done by people who have been convicted of murder, but invariably the Supreme Court takes no jurisdiction. There is not one case, but there are thousands of cases in the Army and the Navy where men have been convicted and on conviction they have been taken off the active list. There is no doubt that this man was given over two years in which to appeal his case. On the appeal the conviction was confirmed. I did not say a word during all the time the appeal was pending, although I was following the matter. The Department of Justice was obstructed at every step of their investigation by the military authorities in their efforts to get the facts. The Bureau of Investigation did a good piece of work in spite of adverse conditions.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman can not take the gentleman from Nebraska off his feet for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. BALDRIGE. No. If it is true that there are thousands of cases, as the gentleman from New York says, in which men have been taken off the pay roll, then this is an unusual situation. Why does it demand legislation in an Army appropriation bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Because that is the only way that we will ever get this man off the pay roll.

Mr. BALDRIGE. There must be some explanation of this particular case.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The only explanation I could get is "Yes; he is on the active list, and we are going to leave him there as long as we can." I got that information yesterday.

Mr. BALDRIGE. I think it is a mistake to legislate for one particular case in the Army bill.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, or for the purpose of offering an amendment to it. The gentleman in his amendment singles out one crime, the crime of murder. Why confine it to murder? There are other equally heinous offenses, and I think the gentleman should change the language so as to have it apply to one convicted of a felony. I move to strike out the word "murder" and insert the word "felony." Will the gentleman accept that amendment?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. A felony? Sure.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, when the unanimous consent was given to return to this point in the bill to offer an amendment, it was given for one specific purpose and not to have amendments offered. I think in the light of good sportsmanship the gentleman should not now offer an amendment, when unanimous consent was given for another particular purpose.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, the unanimous consent was to return to this place in the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment. Everyone knows an amendment is subject to amendment, and when the gentleman allowed it to be returned to and the amendment was offered, he did not foreclose himself, or the author of the amendment, or any other Member of the House from offering an amendment to that amendment. I submit that to single out one offense which is heinous, when there are other offenses committed by soldiers, unfortunately, that some regard equally as heinous as homicide, that it should embrace felonies, especially as it limits it to this case where the conviction has been affirmed by an appellate court.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I am sure I have not taken the House by surprise, because I made my statement before I asked unanimous consent. I would surely be the last person in the world to attempt to take the House by surprise. I stated my case first, and then I asked unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. There would not be any objection to suspending an officer who had been tried and convicted of a felony?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Of course not.

Mr. BLANTON. Who could object to suspending him?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on offering my amendment to strike out the word "murder," and insert in lieu thereof the word "felony."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEVENSON to the amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: Strike out the word "murder" and insert in lieu thereof the word "felony."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BARRACKS AND QUARTERS AND OTHER BUILDINGS AND UTILITIES

For all expenses incident to the construction, installation, operation, and maintenance of buildings, utilities, appurtenances, and accessories necessary for the shelter, protection, and accommodation of the Army and its personnel and property, where not specifically provided for in other appropriations, including personal services, purchase and repair of furniture for quarters for officers, warrant officers, and noncommissioned officers, and officers' messes and wall lockers and refrigerators for Government-owned buildings as may be approved by the Secretary of War, care and improvement of grounds, flooring and framing for tents, rental of buildings, including not to exceed \$900 in the District of Columbia, provided space is not available in Government-owned buildings, and grounds for military purposes and lodgings for recruits and applicants for enlistments, water supply, sewer and fire-alarm systems, fire apparatus, roads, walks, wharves, drainage, dredging channels, purchase of water, disposal of sewage, shooting galleries, ranges for small-arms target practice, field, mobile, and railway artillery practice, including flour for paste for marking targets, such ranges and galleries to be open as far as practicable to the National Guard and organized rifle clubs under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, for furnishing heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, enlisted men, and warrant officers, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons when stationed at and occupying public quarters at military posts, officers of the National Guard attending service and garrison schools, and for recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, offices, the buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1902 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1346), and buildings for a similar purpose on military reservations authorized by War Department regulations; for sale of fuel to officers; fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts, \$11,628,787, and, in addition, \$1,203,700, which is hereby reappropriated of appropriations heretofore made for construction at military posts as follows: In the act entitled "An act to relieve destitution, to broaden the lending powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and to create employment by providing for and expediting a public-works program," approved July 31, 1932, the following projects: Camp Devens, Mass.: Service club, \$27,000, post exchange and gymnasium, \$45,000; Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado: Gymnasium, recreation, and social hall, \$135,000; Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Post exchange, gymnasium, and service club, \$90,000; Fort McClellan, Ala.: Recreation hall, \$31,500, gymnasium, \$40,500; March Field, Calif.: Enlisted men's service club, \$45,000; Randolph Field, Tex.: Gymnasium, completion of, including \$27,000 in the War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1930, \$90,000; Selfridge Field, Mich.: Gymnasium and theater, \$72,000; Albrook Field, Canal Zone: Post exchange, theater, and gymnasium, completion of, including \$39,600 in the War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1932, \$77,400; noncommissioned officers' service club (War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1932), \$27,000; Chanute Field, Ill.: Noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$123,300, central heating plant for technical and quarters area, \$180,000, and in the War Department appropriation acts, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, barracks, \$150,000, and officers' quarters, \$70,000; and \$2,500,000 of this appropriation shall be available immediately for the procurement and transportation of fuel for the service of the fiscal year 1934: *Provided*, That not more than \$16,000 of the appropriations contained in this act shall be available for rent of offices outside the District of Columbia in connection with work incident to the assurance of adequate provision for the mobilization of matériel and industrial organizations essential to war-time needs: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental of offices, garages, and stables for military attachés: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction of a permanent nature of an additional building or an extension or addition to an existing building, the cost of which in any case exceeds \$20,000: *Provided further*, That the monthly rental rate to be paid out of this appropriation for stabling any animal shall not exceed \$15.

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JEFFERS: On page 25, line 13, after "\$1,203,700," strike out all language and figures down to and including "\$70,000" in line 15, page 26.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to direct some questions to the chairman of the subcommittee as to the policy of the committee in recommending theaters, gymnasiums, and recreation rooms and leaving out hospitals.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want five minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like three minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do close in 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman confine that to the amendment just offered?

Mr. JEFFERS. The proponents of the amendment want more than 15 minutes. I know several Members who are interested who want to express themselves.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do close in 30 minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make an inquiry. As I understand it, this is an additional appropriation for improvements and a building program that was authorized last year, and has not been in other appropriation bills?

Mr. COLLINS. This is just a reappropriation; that is all.

Mr. DOWELL. A reappropriation?

Mr. COLLINS. A reappropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and pending amendments close in 30 minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in order. There has been no debate on the paragraph.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the pending amendment.

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, if the committee will give me attention, I shall endeavor to explain as clearly as possible to the committee the meaning of this amendment.

This is a deceptive proposition as you read it. It does not mean the appropriating of more money for projects which we have already authorized but not appropriated for, but it means a reappropriating of or taking away of money which has already been appropriated but not yet expended. In other words, it means the killing of many projects already authorized and appropriated for by the Congress of the United States by taking the money away from those projects by the action of this subcommittee and appropriating it to the other uses of the War Department.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFERS. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. In other words, it is reappropriating money that was appropriated for the special purpose, and putting it into the regular fund for appropriation, adding that much to the appropriation?

Mr. JEFFERS. Yes. All the projects are enumerated in the bill on pages 25 and 26. Each and every one of these projects has been heretofore authorized by the Congress and appropriated for. These projects are located not in any one section, but are spread all over the United States and in the Canal Zone. No one section is specially represented any more than another. They are scattered all over the country from Massachusetts to California, and from Michigan to Texas, and in the Canal Zone. Many States are represented and, as I say, also the Canal Zone.

The appropriations were to be continuous, the money to be expended for these projects whenever the Treasury Department would indicate that the money was available.

These projects were all thoroughly investigated and O. K'd by proper authorities and committees of this Congress. Members of the Military Affairs Committee I am sure are acquainted with the need for the construction of these projects.

I believe there is no Member of the Congress who has given more study to these matters or who is more familiar with them than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES], who, we all know, has made a special study of this proposition all over the country, and I only regret that he is prevented from being here to-day to so express himself.

These projects were included in our very recent relief legislation entitled "An act to relieve destitution and to create employment by providing for and expediting a public-works program, approved July 1, 1932," not yet 1 year old, and other acts of the Congress.

It is actually proposed in this bill that they would arbitrarily take away from these projects specifically enumerated in this bill these amounts which have been duly appropriated by Congress in accordance with the judgment of Members of Congress in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. Bids have actually been advertised for in the case of many of these projects, and in some cases these bids are to be opened in the next few days and the contracts awarded. Contractors all over the country have in good faith secured the plans on these projects in accordance with the regular procedure and have made up and submitted bids; yet this bill would, as I say, arbitrarily block the carrying out of our relief program and strip from these projects the money which has in due course already been appropriated for them by the Congress.

Working people all over the country have looked with much hope to the employment which has been promised them under our emergency relief program, and it would be a crime to say to those craftsmen of all kinds at this time that the Congress did not mean what it said to them and proposes now to withdraw the aid which they so sorely need and upon which they have been counting with confidence. Frankly, it seems to me incomprehensible that the committee would attempt to take upon itself the authority to in this manner overthrow and make void these particular portions of these previous acts of Congress, which, of course, are still in force, especially our recent emergency relief program.

This is not included in the message of the Budget. Mr. Chairman, even the Budget message did not recommend the killing of these projects. There it is right there. I have marked it here on this page so that Members can see it if they wish; you can see where they have inserted this language killing these projects which, as I say, was not recommended by the Budget.

The list of projects included in this amendment, all of which have been heretofore authorized and appropriated for, and for which funds are available, are as follows:

In the act entitled "An act to relieve destitution, to broaden the lending powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and to create employment by providing for and expediting a public-works program," approved July 31, 1932, the following projects:

Camp Devens, Mass.: Service club, \$27,000; post exchange and gymnasium, \$45,000.

Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado: Gymnasium, recreation, and social hall, \$135,000.

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Post exchange, gymnasium, and service club, \$90,000.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Recreation hall, \$31,500; gymnasium, \$40,500.

March Field, Calif.: Enlisted men's service club, \$45,000.

Randolph Field, Tex.: Gymnasium, completion of, including \$27,000 in the War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1930, \$90,000.

Selfridge Field, Mich.: Gymnasium and theater, \$72,000.

Albrook Field, Canal Zone: Post exchange, theater, and gymnasium, completion of, including \$39,600 in the War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1932, \$77,400; non-commissioned officers' service club (War Department appropriation act, fiscal year 1932), \$27,000.

Chanute Field, Ill.: Noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$123,300; central heating plant for technical and quarters area, \$180,000; and in the War Department appropriation acts, fiscal years 1930 and 1931, barracks, \$150,000, and officers' quarters, \$70,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the importance of this amendment, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. JEFFERS: On page 25, line 13, after the figures "\$11,628,787," strike out all down to and including \$70,000, in line 15 on page 26.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I not only want to wipe out the detail for this thing but I want to wipe out the reappropriation.

This calls for the appropriation of \$1,203,700 which has already been appropriated in some other way, and it calls for the expenditure of this money for things which are not necessary activities of the Government at this time. They are things that we can get along without and have been getting along without, and would get along without right along if it had not been for the imagination of some one that some way or other this sort of thing was connected with unemployment relief, but it is not connected with unemployment relief because it does not provide any substantial employment. It takes \$3,200 to put one man to work for a year on any one of these projects. It does not provide enough work to amount to anything, and it does not relieve unemployment because it provides for the levying of an additional tax upon the people which far outweighs any possible relief of unemployment.

Every one of these items is for a service club, a post exchange, a gymnasium, a social hall, and this sort of thing. Now, they have in every one of these posts something that is serving the purpose of these things and getting along all right, and we ought to wait until we get to the point where the people of the United States can afford to have something of this kind. We can not afford it at this time, and we ought not to spread ourselves all over the lot on things we can get along without.

I hope the membership of this House will now put its foot down and say that we are going to start in trying to economize. Somebody will tell you that it does not take any money out of the Treasury because it is a reappropriation, but everybody knows that every bit of money that has been appropriated which is not used and reverts to the Treasury relieves the burden of the taxpayers just that much more; and that is what we ought to do here—put our foot down and stop spending money. If we do not do it, we are never going to meet our obligation to balance the Federal Budget. Let us start right here and pass the amendment as amended by the substitute and cut out \$1,203,000, which we can get along without.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARLAN to the amendment offered by Mr. JEFFERS: On page 26, in line 10, after "\$27,000," strike out down to and including "\$70,000," in line 15, on page 26.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, I should have no serious objection, I believe, to Mr. TABER's substitute to the Jeffers amendment. However, how that will be determined, of course, is conjectural. The thing I want to call to the atten-

tion of the committee is that if the Jeffers amendment is adopted we certainly ought to eliminate from that amendment the portion of the amendment that strikes out the former appropriation made for Chanute Field in Illinois.

There has not been one word from the Air Corps of the War Department favoring this appropriation, so far as I have been able to find, for Chanute Field. Chanute Field was a post at the time of the World War. There are a lot of buildings there that are not now even worth their destruction. They are falling down. It is a little field of 640 acres, used now for a technical school.

The appropriations provided in this bill cover something like \$523,000. This does not half cover the picture. If this appropriation goes through, then it will be up to the Government, in some future appropriation, to appropriate for a hospital which we will have to have out there. We will also have to appropriate for a quartermaster building and for the maintenance building of a quartermaster corps. We will also have to appropriate for a gymnasium. None of these things are at this field now. It is a small, poorly equipped, ineffective field in Illinois which they have been trying to find some use for and have not been able to find it. There are other fields in the country to which this school could be removed. There is a field in Montgomery, Ala., and there is a field in Ohio, the Patterson Field, and these fields already have these administrative buildings. There is ample room at these other fields to take care of all the activities that are now going on at Chanute Field, and there may be other fields that I do not know that have these buildings already equipped that will not have to be duplicated.

When you are making this appropriation of \$523,000 you are just starting. You are going to need an additional appropriation of \$305,000 for the buildings I just enumerated.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress in the past, in 1929, and once before, made appropriations for this field, but the War Department, which is interested in maintaining an Army in this country and in maintaining an efficient military force, has refused to use the appropriation until it was finally included in this blanket bill, and then it was accepted only because there was no chance, apparently, of getting anything else.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I am sorry, but I can not yield now.

This is a shining example of pork barrel, logrolling methods being applied to our military life. I think it is time for a thing of this kind to stop.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I am sorry, but I can not yield.

What we should be interested in here, Mr. Chairman, is the efficiency and effectiveness of our military arm, and when we have fields over the country that have all the buildings and equipment that we will have to ultimately put at this field, why should we put these improvements in now? We have fields that are large and are located, as the chairman said in his address last Saturday in industrial centers where these students will have the benefit of industrial life.

Look at what we are doing now. We are developing engines at Patterson Field, at Dayton, Ohio, and we have to send them to Chanute Field for these men over there to study. Why not have the students where the experimental work is being done? Why not have the students where they will be in industrial centers where they can come in contact with other forms of industrial life and where aircraft work is being developed right under their eyes and they can see it and learn it from the ground up.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, never before, I am frank to admit, was I so confused as to the real meaning of the paragraph proposed to be stricken out by the amendment under consideration. It is owing to the membership of the House to disclose just what is intended to be affected by the paragraph as reported by the committee.

The committee appropriates \$11,628,000 for post-exchange construction, which is a cut of \$1,872,000 from the Budget estimate. It is proposed by the committee to increase that amount by \$1,203,700, which is the amount heretofore appropriated for dance halls, gymnasiums, and so forth, as specifically enumerated in the bill. It is the position of the committee that this appropriation for emergency construction for post exchanges, gymnasiums, and recreation halls should be eliminated and that the appropriation in the given amount should be used for barracks and quarters.

Now, gentlemen should get this clearly in mind that the effect of adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is to continue the appropriation for gymnasiums and recreation halls and post exchanges at the various stations throughout the United States and the insular possessions.

If you are in favor of having the emergency program as carried in the last construction act for these various posts continued, you will vote in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, and that money will continue to be available.

I appeal to you to stand by the committee. They believe, as I do, that expenditure for these stated places can not be defended in these pressing times. I recall that this very subject was investigated by the Committee on Military Affairs in the last Congress, when the present chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN], and I and others were appointed as a subcommittee to recommend a building program for the Army. We did not believe then, and I did not believe the last time, that there was any justification in appropriating money for these purposes. If you are in favor of economy, stand by the committee and vote down these various amendments.

That is the sum and substance of the effect of the proposals. You have the facts, and I believe you should uphold the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS. I wish to ask the gentleman if the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does not include the elimination of the appropriation of \$1,203,000—if that were left in the bill, it would be used for repairs. I do not believe the gentleman meant to eliminate that. Every year the Appropriations Committee appropriates money for repairs. This year the committee has authorized approximately \$700,000 less than last year for repairs, namely, \$1,203,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. The position of the gentlewoman is correct, as I understand the phraseology.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I believe the membership of the committee is in doubt about the Taber amendment. I feel very sure that they do not understand that if this \$1,203,000 is eliminated from the bill that the money will be eliminated for the repair work, which the committee is anxious to have done and which it placed in the bill for that express purpose. It is approximately \$700,000 less than it appropriated for repair work last year. It would be manifestly unfair not to make any appropriation for repair work which is vitally needed.

But this \$1,203,000 should not be taken at the expense of the building projects which were appropriated for under the emergency relief bill which was passed last July. We must not rob Peter to pay Paul. The Jeffers amendment would leave the \$1,203,000 in the bill for repairs and would also allow the construction projects to be built out of funds which Congress appropriated last July for that purpose. Those funds are now in the Treasury, to remain there until expended. The Jeffers amendment requires no new appropriation. I shall ask the chairman of the committee to please explain, when we come to the National Guard appropriation, why he has increased that more than \$4,000,000 over the 1933 appropriation and more than \$8,000,000 over

the 1934 Budget estimates. It seems as if he were taking away necessary funds from the War Department to give to the Militia Bureau.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think I was mistaken in the construction of this language. I think I am satisfied with the way the committee brought it in in the bill. It will do away with these detailed expenditures, and will use the money which was intended for what I believe are not necessary things for repairs and upkeep, and repairs and upkeep have already been cut by \$700,000, and probably that is as large a cut as is warranted.

Mrs. ROGERS. Then the gentleman is satisfied to leave that in the bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes; if the committee proposition stays, I am satisfied.

Mrs. ROGERS. I now wish to speak about the Jeffers amendment. Fort Devens is in my own district. It is a permanent military post. There are approximately 800 men there. There will be more as time goes on. These buildings are a necessary part of the construction work and of the development item. I thought that other buildings should go up first, but I suppose the War Department knows more about Army posts than I do. They asked for them last year. They say they are vitally needed. They are necessary for the morale of the men. Most of these Army posts are away from the large cities. We heard a great deal during the World War about keeping up the morale of the men. It is just as necessary to keep up the morale of the men in peace times, and not as easy as during the war when everyone was fired with patriotic enthusiasm and fervor. At present everyone has been cut and everyone is worried. In my opinion, it is necessary to keep up the morale of everybody at this particular time.

Mr. JEFFERS. The gentlewoman is aware and the House should be aware of the fact that there are no dance halls in these. There are gymnasiums and recreation halls for the physical well-being of the Army; and if they do not have opportunity to go to them, they go to the cities and come back perhaps in worse shape than they otherwise would be.

Mrs. ROGERS. They provide a place where the men can go and write to their families, a place where they can receive their families and friends. Those of you who are familiar with Army posts realize what an important part it is of a post. This money was appropriated last year in the emergency relief bill to relieve destitution. People have been looking forward to getting this work before summer. These people need work desperately. Every single contract for these buildings will be let by June. It will give a great deal of employment. In these days of terrible unrest I can not believe that anyone really wants to do away with anything that has to do with our national defense or with citizenship. The incident which occurred next door yesterday, involving the shooting of two men, the killing of one of them, to my mind, points conclusively to the fact that we must make our men good citizens and loyal Americans and patriotic. I can not believe that the House will do away with these very necessary buildings.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I am sure the gentlewoman feels and knows that these gymnasiums and recreational centers are just as much a part of national defense as is the drill on the drill field?

Mrs. ROGERS. Absolutely; now that there is such a shortage of money for various things, the men do manual labor about the camp, which does not correspond to gymnasium work. They do not have time for the actual setting-up exercises and drills, which are necessary for a well-trained soldier. Gymnasium work in a way takes the place of drills. Soldiers must be kept physically fit.

Mr. MAAS. And if they should happen to use this gymnasium for dances, does not the gentlewoman think it would

be better to so use it than for them to go to dance halls in the city?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. SHANNON. And also, in all of these bills all of these things are used as a blind in order that the bureaus in the Army may construct a building for the purpose of selling various kinds of merchandise?

Mrs. ROGERS. I think that is not true. I think the gentleman is confused about that.

Mr. SHANNON. This bill is full of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In the first place, let us understand what this is all about, and, in the second place, let us remind ourselves that two appropriation bills that come before this House are invariably loaded down with amendments increasing appropriations under the guise of preparedness and patriotism. I refer to the Army appropriation bill and the Navy appropriation bill. When we had the agricultural bill under consideration and provisions for its scientific and research bureaus were before us, then the economists and Budget balancers took the center of the stage and were strong for economy. When we have the Army and the Navy appropriation bills under consideration, then under the guise of patriotism the pork-barrel specialists get into the play. There is nothing in this item that directly or indirectly, or even remotely, has to do with preparedness or with efficiency in the Army. Of course, a well-equipped gymnasium is desirable—it always is—

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Just a moment. All of the items involved in the present amendments are for gymnasiums, recreation centers, or construction of that kind. Several posts in various States are interested, hence the mass attack to reinstate the appropriation. Here you have Fort Huachuca, Ariz., remote and away from any city, and if there is any post entitled to a gymnasium or recreation hall it is here, yet even that can be dispensed with at this time. I lived in Fort Huachuca 40 years ago when I was a little boy. I can see now the parade ground and the barracks on one side and the officers' quarters on the other, around the parade grounds, and the little adobe houses where we lived, a dry, wild country. In those days the soldiers would go out hunting and would indulge in athletics, and would eat salt pork and hard-tack, and they were real he-fighting men. Now they want to have a recreation center, play ping-pong in a gymnasium, wear issue rayon underwear, and dance with one another under the proper chaperoning of a stern and salaried hostess. [Laughter.] If you are going to appeal on the ground of preparedness, then I am ready to meet you on that issue. The appropriation under discussion has nothing to do with preparedness or national defense.

Mr. JEFFERS. Very well, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In just a moment. If you come forward and say that you want to give these boys social atmosphere and that the purpose of the Army is to have social centers, with social life, if it is intended to teach them to dance the cotillion under proper supervision and chaperonage, then that is another question, and I am not an authority on that. I do submit that in these days, when Congress has reduced the pay of the employees of the Government, when you have in a horizontal cut reduced every appropriation bill, we ought to stand by the committee and at least in this instance prevent appropriations which are unnecessary, which are not related to preparedness or efficiency of the Army.

Mr. JEFFERS. The physical well-being is certainly related to preparedness in the Army.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Physical well-being of course. The soldier every morning has setting-up exercises; he has good, wholesome, and sufficient food; he has plenty of exercise; he has no worries; he has the best of medical care, what more can we do for his physical well-being? He can go out and walk and run and train; he can do anything that he wants to, but it is not necessary to have a dance hall for him and

a marble-fitted gymnasium or anything else. As a matter of fact, all the exercise and training in the world can be had without a gymnasium.

Mr. JEFFERS. The bill does not indicate dance halls.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I submit that those boys out in Arizona in the eighties might have been hard boiled, but they were as patriotic and as good soldiers as these rayon-underwared, ping-pong playing, dancing soldiers that you are trying to create.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I ask the gentleman if in all fairness he should make a statement of that kind when there is included in this amendment, the care of 547 ambulant tubercular patients at the Fitzsimons Hospital—ambulant meaning that they are able to get out of their beds and go to some place where they may have directed exercises. It is a part of their treatment for tuberculosis.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman is familiar with the layout of Fitzsimons Hospital. It is splendidly laid out, and the personnel we have there ought with a little ingenuity on the part of officers in command, to be able to take care of every possible activity necessary to the cure and rehabilitation of these patients.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I will state that those in charge of that hospital have and do exercise ingenuity in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Ingenuity has been exercised.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think the committee language ought to remain just as it is. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute which I offered, and I shall support the committee in objecting to the Jeffers amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asks unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute offered for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the rather involved parliamentary situation before us here, and also the fact that I am very desirous that the committee be sustained in this bill as it is drafted, to clear the atmosphere, I will withdraw the amendment which I offered to the amendment offered by Mr. JEFFERS. This is not because I am mistaken in my procedure, as the gentleman from Wisconsin just said. My amendment to Mr. JEFFERS's amendment will accomplish what is desired, but the whole parliamentary situation is too confused to be easily understood.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, there were appropriated in the relief act funds for the construction of service clubs, post exchanges, gymnasiums, social halls, and so on, at various military posts throughout the country, and the committee asked for information as to all of such types of projects that had not been contracted to be constructed. For all buildings of that particular type that had not been contracted for construction we have provided here that the money be reappropriated and diverted to the maintenance and repair of barracks and quarters and other buildings and utilities in the Army.

Mr. JEFFERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I do not have but a few minutes.

Every dime of the money that would go into the building of dance halls, theaters, and social clubs will be expended in the maintenance and repair of barracks and quarters and other public buildings in the Army, with the result that there will be as much money expended for labor and ma-

terials as would go into the construction of the dance halls and theaters.

Mr. JEFFERS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. COLLINS. I can not yield.

Now, Mr. Chairman, have we reached a point where we are willing to put all of the "pork" possible into this bill, and in times like these build dance halls and theaters and activities like those mentioned on pages 25 and 26 of the bill?

Now, if we want to label that sort of "pork" "military defense," let us let our constituents back home know it and know what sort of individuals they have here representing them.

As to Chanute Field, construction money for which is included in this reappropriation and diversion program, the United States Army assembled a board, and that board recommended the abandonment of Chanute Field.

There was money appropriated in the relief act and in other acts for reviving activities at Chanute Field, and Chanute Field is nothing in the world except a school where mechanics in the Air Corps can be trained, and at a place called Fairfield, near Dayton, they have all the buildings now that they need.

Mr. ADKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I can not yield.

They have all the buildings that they need. They have all of the administration buildings, all of the shops, and all of the other activities that they need.

Mrs. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I can not yield.

Now, I have had a statement submitted to me by the Chief of the Air Corps, in which he states that if Chanute Field is continued, it will be continued over his objection, and it will cost \$5,225,500 to develop it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. JEFFERS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JEFFERS) there were ayes 43 and noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EATON of Colorado: Page 25, lines 21 to 23, after the figures "\$45,000," in line 21, strike out "Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado, gymnasium, recreation and social hall, \$135,000"; and in line 13, strike out "\$1,203,700" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,068,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this place a statement prepared by the Medical Department of the Army, explaining this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will be allowed to extend his remarks as indicated.

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The statement which I am permitted to insert is as follows:

On page 25, lines 21, 22, and 23, this bill proposes to cancel the construction of a "gymnasium, recreation, and social hall" already appropriated for at the Fitzsimons General Hospital. The Committee on Appropriations has considered this project on a par with exchanges, theaters, gymnasium, and service clubs at the ordinary military posts. This is evidenced by the committee report (No. 1835) as shown in the first sentence under "Barracks and quarters," page 13, where it is erroneously included and classified with "Nonessential projects at military posts."

The need for a gymnasium at a large hospital should not be considered in the same way that such a building would be at an ordinary station. This gymnasium, recreation, and social hall is for a hospital—everything at this station is there because it is a hospital. Such a building has been needed as a therapeutic measure for many years and should not be longer delayed. To-day there are 1,162 sick at this tuberculosis hospital, 547 of which are

ambulant and semiambulant and require gymnastic or graduated exercises. Without a gymnasium and its special equipment this work is limited to outdoor exercises on pleasant days and only during the warmer season.

This building, therefore, while its proper title is as given, is required for the proper daily treatment of about 200 ambulatory sick, and is necessary for therapeutic purposes as part of the whole hospital. Some \$1,200 has already been expended in drawing up the plans for the building, and the Quartermaster General's office expected to call for bids next month for this construction authorized by Congress in the relief bill last year.

In order that this intention of Congress may be carried on without further interruption, it is necessary to amend the bill by striking out the words in lines 21, 22, and 23, page 25 of H. R. 14199, which read "Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colo.: Gymnasium, recreation, and social hall, \$135,000."

In order to make the figures in the bill agree with this amendment, move also to strike out the figures \$1,203,700 in line 13, page 25, and insert in lieu thereof \$1,068,700.

I take this opportunity of here publicly expressing the appreciation of hundreds of patients, their wives and children, and their fathers and mothers, of the most excellent administrations of Colonels Hutton, Halloran, and Buck during whose terms the advance in the treatment of tuberculosis and the ingenuity in adapting new remedies therefor has been greater than during any other decade. To be twitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] about the ingenuity of those who administer the affairs of Fitzsimons Hospital merely shows how little is known of the wonderful results which come from the treatments given to those tubercular patients who have been sent to this hospital from all parts of the United States.

Their ingenuity is continually finding ways and means to adapt the meager appropriations for this hospital, and, of course, they will continue so to do and get for the Treasury of the United States more value for each dollar authorized than at any other hospital or post in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARNOLD: On page 26, line 10, after "\$27,000," strike out down to and including "\$70,000," in line 15.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this is a very important matter, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Page 27, line 6, after the period, add the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the removal, razing, or dismantling of any building, utility, fixture, improvement, or appurtenance at Fort D. A. Russell."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 26, line 25, after the word "further," strike out the balance of line 25 and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 27, as far as the colon after the figures "\$20,000."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEWERAGE SYSTEM, FORT MONROE, VA.

For repair and maintenance of wharf and apron of wharf, including all necessary labor and material therefor, fuel for waiting rooms; water, brooms, and shovels, \$20,280; for one-third of said sum, to be supplied by the United States, \$6,760.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe Congress should stop and think a little before it appropriates a large sum of money for the repair of buildings at these various posts, some of which should be abandoned. A reserve officer, who is very well acquainted with the activities of the Army, spent two months analyzing the hearings on the last Army appropriation bill and prepared this map, which he sent to me. It shows that we have 151 Army posts garrisoned with troops in this country. We have 46 general and branch depots. We have 13 manufacturing arsenals. We have 48 procurement agencies for supplies. We have 13 special-service schools; and we have 9 corps-area headquarters. These activities are scattered all over the country, as you see, but most of them are centered around Pennsylvania, Virginia, New Jersey, Delaware, and New York. Look at San Francisco and around San Francisco. You find seven posts garrisoned with troops.

We have heard a great deal lately about the closing of a certain fort on the Mexican border. The gentleman has made a strong case. There are 17 posts on the Mexican border garrisoned with troops and still complaint is made because you close one of them. Probably this one should not have been closed. He charges politics entered into the question. It should not, but most likely it did, as he has produced evidence.

I contend the posts can be grouped into, say, a dozen places in the United States, and a world of money would be saved. Why, out in the western country, as you see by the map, are forts that were placed there before we were born to look after the hostile Indians, but we have no hostile Indians out there now. Those posts are obsolete and should be closed.

The President of the United States can do nothing better than to get a corps of experts around him to investigate the closing of these forts and, I might add, close up useless navy yards. You can not do it in Congress, because you will be voted down; but give somebody the power to do it and save the Government a real amount of money.

A thorough investigation by the President through a committee of experts of all activities of the Army and Navy with a view to consolidating activities is what is needed. Start with the recruiting stations. Let Congress increase the President's power to include military and naval activities. He now can only consolidate activities not of a military or naval nature.

Here is a real opportunity for economy. The savings the first year should exceed \$25,000,000. Do you know you have nearly 50,000 civilian employees in the Navy? I do not know how many in the Army.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. How will money be saved by breaking up these posts?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. By consolidating them.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. How does that save money? We have to pay the men who are in them.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That is not the outstanding expense. The gentleman from Illinois is a business man. If the gentleman had four or five plants within a radius of a few miles of the main plant, does not the gentleman think it would save money if the outlying plants should be brought in and combined with the main plant?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Notwithstanding all this talk we have heard about Army posts, I can not see where we would save anything by breaking them up.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The trouble with the gentleman is that he, like myself, does not know anything about it. I mean, does not understand the inside.

What we need is somebody who knows something about the inside workings of the Army and Navy who can go out and investigate the posts and naval activities and, regardless of what Congressman's district or Senator's State they

may be in, close them up and consolidate them if that will save money.

I am not talking now about reducing the personnel, but those who say we can not save money by consolidating Army and Navy activities do not know anything about the workings of the Army and Navy.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And in addition to that when they are maneuvered in their annual training they must concentrate all these troops in these scattered posts and bring them together.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. There is absolutely no doubt about that. Right there is a large savings in transportation alone. Who will question that? Keep the more important posts and close up or sell the others. Do not send good money after bad money by repairing all the old worn-out buildings at obsolete stations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Almost every time you put two or three posts together you have to build new barracks for them to move to, and it costs a lot more money to make available these extra barracks and abandon the ones existing than it does to keep on occupying the existing ones.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I think the gentleman's excuse to retain some Army posts up in New York is not sound. Just look at the Army posts around New York; look at these pins, and about 20 of them have fallen off this map. What you spend for new barracks will be saved the first year. You can save this appropriation if you will, now.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman know any posts where there are sufficient barracks to take care of consolidations?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It looks like a forest of pins up in the gentleman's section. If you do not have sufficient barracks spend this money to be used for repairs to build new ones at permanent posts.

Mr. TABER. When the whole picture is placed before us we will see the gentleman's proposition will not result in a saving.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I say again that even if we have to build new barracks, in the long run the savings will prove they were amply justified. Concentrate our troops, and it will be easier to learn what is being done by our Army. Keep them scattered as they are, and no one knows what they are doing. I am not a small-army man, but I do see where, by proper administration, there is an opportunity to save the taxpayers millions of dollars. We give too much attention to the congressional districts rather than to what is best for our national defense.

Mr. BLANTON. As a member of the committee I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BANKHEAD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee, for five minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would not take this time but for the reference of my friend Mr. COCHRAN to and criticizing the stand taken by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] in protesting against the removal of Fort D. A. Russell from the Mexican border.

I am glad the gentleman from Missouri has brought this map here. If you will look down South, along the Rio Grande, you will see the Mexican border, 2,000 miles of it.

It is the only border concerning which, because of bandits like Villa and revolutionists, there is any menace whatever to the peace of the United States just now. Look at the few scattered posts now left along that 2,000 miles of Mexican border! You will see a concentration of posts at San Antonio, which is distant from the Rio Grande about 200 miles. I am about 500 miles from the Mexican border. But when I first came to Congress I represented the old Jumbo western district that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] now represents.

Do you know why all those posts are grouped at San Antonio? Do you know why most of the posts are concentrated in and near big cities here in the East? It is for society purposes for the Army officers. [Laughter.] They do not like to stay down there in a nonpopulous mesquite territory where they are needed. They want to go to social centers where they can be entertained. San Antonio is one of the finest cities in the United States. They have multimillionaires from New England who come down there to spend the winters. There is plenty of high society in San Antonio. Army officers get plenty of receptions and entertainment in San Antonio and they and their wives all like San Antonio. They and their wives all like the East and they all like the big cities. They do not like to live away from a continuity of social functions.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I ask the gentleman from Texas to look at the black marks on this map all the way along that border. They are not in San Antonio, they are all along the border there.

Mr. BLANTON. You will find more of them in San Antonio and one city in California than you will find all put together along the 2,000 miles of Mexican border.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. How about the 19 along here [indicating]?

Mr. BLANTON. How about the 27 over here in and around one city?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The 19 are along the Mexican border.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the 115 in the various big cities up, in, and around the New York territory? Army officers and their wives must have social functions. They are raised in a social atmosphere from the time they enter West Point until they retire as major generals.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. They tell me they are afraid of those tumbleweeds that blow down there.

Mr. BLANTON. No; they get tired of looking at those lonesome mountains down there where the only deer they have are black tailed and none of the bear are tame, and where Villa once carried on his ferocious manipulations.

My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] is right. It was an outrage to abandon Fort D. A. Russell. The gentleman knows there has been \$1,000,000 of our money spent there. He knows this property will be junked and he knows that when they are forced to go back down there, which they will have to do some time with their cavalry outfit, they will waste another million dollars for new barracks and equipment.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman is absolutely right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, this question of consolidating forts in order to attain economy is an illusion. In the first place, there are no vacant barracks or officers' quarters at any post. If you are going to take troops and officers from one post to another and abandon an existing post, you have to build new facilities at the new post. You would have to abandon millions of dollars of construction and go into millions of dollars of new construction.

But this is not the most important part of it. We have a very small establishment in peace times, which is in harmony with our military philosophy. We have the seventeenth army in size in the world. We could not defend our country with the established Army, and we do not pretend that we could. They are school teachers to train an army if an emergency arises. The most important part of

training is command. Every captain of the Regular Army will be a colonel or probably a brigadier general in the expansion of the Army in a war. This would have to be true. The important thing is that they have training in command, and a major who commands a small outpost is training himself in command to be a general when a war comes.

If we should consolidate the Army into three or four posts and have three or four commanding officers, we would have only three or four men who would know anything about command in time of war. You can not save a dime in this way and you would hurt national defense immensely.

Another most important consideration in leaving the Army well distributed throughout the country in moderate-sized posts is the maintenance of domestic tranquillity. It is vital in a country as large as ours, even if only for the salutary effect in preventing a tendency to sectional disorders, that the troops be readily available in every section of the country.

While I am on my feet I want to refer to another section of the bill simply to clear up another matter.

Reference was made to the Army's playing favorites in keeping on the active list a certain officer who was convicted of murder. The Army has no interest in this case. I want to simply point out to the House the fact that neither the Army nor even the President of the United States can remove this man. An act of Congress, of course, could remove him. Until every last appeal under our judicial system has been exhausted, the law prohibits the Army from removing this man. I want to clear up any doubt that the Army has been playing politics in keeping this man on the active list. They have no interest in the matter; but until the last court has spoken or until the time for an appeal to the last court has expired, the Army is absolutely helpless, and in this respect the Army is simply complying with the law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In view of what my fighting friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] had to say about the abandonment of Fort Russell, I want to briefly call your attention to some more waste that is being practiced.

This post was abandoned almost overnight and the officers and animals scattered all over the country. Over 600 men were shipped at great expense 2,000 miles to Kentucky to go into a mechanized unit, although there was a resolution pending before the Committee on Military Affairs asking for a hearing on the matter. The War Department, to show its authority and arrogance, on January 5 of this month sent out an invitation for bids to dismantle portions of that post. I think some of them also wanted to show contempt for their friends in Congress. Less than a year ago they spent about \$6,000 for a magnificent new refrigerator system at this post, and I now hold in my hand their invitation for bids to dismantle this equipment and take it to Fort Brown, Tex., which was for a long time at the top of the list of posts to be abandoned, but to please the Republican national committeeman from Texas Fort Brown came off the list, and to-day the order to abandon that post is completely rescinded. And yet we hear much talk about economy, fair dealing, and protection of the Mexican border.

I say this Congress is entitled to an investigation of any such procedure. Overnight they abandon a million dollars' worth of property, send troops to a place where they are not needed, and disband a Cavalry outfit to please some people who would mechanize the entire Army of the United States.

If the War Department wants to do the right thing, it will not dismantle any part of this post until we can have a hearing and determine the merits of the case. There are a number of small interior posts in the country that ought to be abandoned. There is no opposition to such a program. There is nothing to justify abandonment of needed Mexican border posts. One excuse is to abolish the

Cavalry and mechanize everything, to the delight of the technocrats. The other is the War Department idea of more and bigger parades. I expect to fight both schools of thought so long as I am a Member of this body.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rakes, shovels, and brooms; repairs to roadway, pavements, macadam and asphalt block; repairs to street crossings; repairs to street drains, and labor for cleaning roads, \$8,469; for two-thirds of said sum, to be supplied by the United States, \$5,646.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object to that.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, the movement to push branch banking through this session of Congress is a desperate effort on the part of centralized greed permanently to monopolize the credit of this country. This struggle for branch banking is the principal salient in the great struggle between traditional individualism in this country and modern centralization of wealth and credit. This struggle presents two schools of thought which are directly opposite as to the course which is best for America to follow.

From Mr. Roosevelt's Columbus speech the American people were given to understand that he was opposed to the modern trend toward centralized credit. The people took him at his word. His Columbus speech had a greater influence on the election than any one speech which was delivered during the campaign.

After Mr. Roosevelt becomes President he can not, in the light of this speech, ever approve of branch banking. This is something which is well known by everyone. No one knows it any better than the apostles of branch banking. This is why they are trying to ramrod it through this session of Congress.

This is not a partisan issue. Those who believe in retaining opportunity for individualism are found in both parties. Those who believe in further centralizing the business of this country are to be found in both parties. We are all on common ground in the proposition that we know that the centralization of credit means the centralization of business opportunity, and we all know that the retention of decentralized credit means retaining opportunity for individual business.

The forces who believe in centralizing the credit of this country are being led by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. GLASS, in his determination to force through branch banking in this session of Congress. In these forces there are to be found both Democrats and Republicans.

It is the old story; when the artful and suave forces of greed can not justify their position by logic or reason they try to becloud the issue and fool the public by raising a personal issue. Just now these forces are becoming very much interested in the ability of the United States to legislate. They are raging a public furor against a Senate filibuster and are trying to make it a personal issue by endeavoring to use the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] as red herring to be dragged across their trail in the hope that it may kill the scent of their own greed. As they uplift their hands in horror against the Senator from Louisiana they are in fact deceitfully trying to becloud the public mind while they monopolize the credit of this country and steal it away from agriculture and individual business, commercial, industrial, and mineral, as well as destroying small banking.

It is now being whispered around the House that when this bill gets over to the House it will never be sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but that it will be lifted from the Speaker's table. This extraordinary procedure can not be done unless the Speaker of this House

joins in this conspiracy against individual credit and local banking. I can not believe that the Speaker and Vice President elect will permit this to be done. If he does permit this to be done, he belies everything which he has ever said during his long tenure in the House of Representatives. He has always professed to be the friend of the so-called "little fellow." The House of Representatives can not permit this to be done without at least four-fifths of the membership selling their own districts and their own constituencies down the river.

What is more, this branch banking bill can not pass this Congress without the President elect's silently being a party to this program against individual business and repudiating everything he said in the campaign and particularly in his Columbus speech. A President elect should not be dragged in on legislation before he takes office. However, Governor Roosevelt, by his own choice, has chosen to dictate an intolerable farm bill known as the so-called allotment bill as it passed the House of Representatives. He has chosen to step in and prevent a sales tax when the Democratic leadership in the House advanced it. He has also chosen to stop any consideration of the foreign-debt problem until he gets into office. Having taken his position in these three matters, he is now in a position where he can not permit any extension of branch banking to pass this Congress without the responsibility for it being upon his hands just as much as if such a bill should pass the next Congress and meet with his approval. If Mr. Roosevelt permits branch banking to pass this Congress or permits it to have his approval after he comes into office, he has made mockery and hypocrisy of his preelection statements pertaining to the forgotten man.

When the banking system of this country through the process of branch banking is surrendered to centralized finance, the thousands of local bankers, all local business men, all farmers, and all individuals and small corporations engaged in industry, manufacturing and mineral, sink far below the status of the forgotten man. They become the lost men.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIR CORPS, ARMY

For creating, maintaining, and operating at established flying schools and balloon schools courses of instruction for officers, students, and enlisted men, including cost of equipment and supplies necessary for instruction, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, instruments, and materials for theoretical and practical instruction; for maintenance, repair, storage, and operation of airships, war balloons, and other aerial machines, including instruments, materials, gas plants, hangars, and repair shops, and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction, or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith and the establishment of landing and take-off runways; for purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs in connection with aerial photography; improvement, equipment, maintenance, and operation of plants for testing and experimental work, and procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, gas, and sewerage, including maintenance, operation, and repair of such utilities at such plants; for the procurement of helium gas; for travel of officers of the Air Corps by air and rail in connection with the administration of this appropriation, not to exceed \$92,825; salaries and wages of civilian employees as may be necessary, and not to exceed \$131,315 for payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses as authorized by existing law; transportation of materials in connection with consolidation of Air Corps activities; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of airplanes and balloons, accessories thereto, and aviation engines, including plans, drawings, and specifications thereof, and the purchase of letters patent, application for letters patent, licenses under letters patent and applications for letters patent; for the purchase, manufacture, and construction of airplanes and balloons, including instruments and appliances of every sort and description necessary for the operation, construction (airplanes and balloons), or equipment of all types of aircraft, and all necessary spare parts and equipment connected therewith; for the marking of military airways where the purchase of land is not involved; for the purchase, manufacture, and issue of special clothing, wearing apparel, and similar equipment for aviation purposes; for all necessary expenses connected with the sale or disposal of surplus or obsolete aeronautical equipment, and the rental of buildings, and other facilities for the handling or storage of such equipment; for the services of not more than four consulting engineers at experimental stations of the Air Corps as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, at

rates of pay to be fixed by him not to exceed \$50 a day for not exceeding 50 days each and necessary traveling expenses; purchase of special apparatus and appliances, repairs and replacements of same used in connection with special scientific medical research in the Air Corps; for maintenance and operation of such Air Corps printing plants outside of the District of Columbia as may be authorized in accordance with law; for publications, station libraries, special furniture, supplies and equipment for offices, shops, and laboratories; for special services, including the salvaging of wrecked aircraft, \$23,324,185: *Provided*, That from the amount herein appropriated and the amount herein authorized for obligation not to exceed \$3,670,875 may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees other than those employed in experimental and research work; not exceeding \$17,000 may be expended for the procurement of helium from the Bureau of Mines, of which sum such amounts as may be required may be transferred in advance to that bureau; not exceeding \$3,035,429 may be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or balloons and their equipment, including the pay of necessary civilian employees; not less than \$8,257,807 shall be expended for the production or purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, and accessories, of which \$7,614,522 shall be available exclusively for combat airplanes, their equipment and accessories; not less than \$9,130,100 shall be expended, other than for pay of civilian employees, for aviation fuel and oil and for the repair and maintenance of airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories; and not more than \$6,000 may be expended for settlement of claims (not exceeding \$250 each) for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Chief of Air Corps and the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amounts herein provided for the procurement of new airplanes and for the procurement of equipment, spare parts, and accessories for airplanes, the Chief of the Air Corps, when authorized by the Secretary of War, may enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1934, for the procurement of new airplanes and for the procurement of equipment, spare parts, and accessories for airplanes to an amount not in excess of \$3,000,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the sum of \$25,000 of the appropriation for Air Corps, Army, fiscal year 1931, shall remain available until June 30, 1934, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1, 1931: *Provided further*, That none of the money appropriated in this act shall be used for the purchase of any airplane ordered after the approval of this act which is equipped or propelled by a Liberty motor or by any motor or airplane engine purchased or constructed prior to July 1, 1920.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 20, before the semicolon, insert a comma and the following: "exclusive of the cost of transporting new aircraft from the factory to first destination."

Mr. COLLINS. That is for the purpose of sending new planes to the first destination.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 21, strike out the figures "\$131,315" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,490."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Mississippi a question. What is the status of the commissioned personnel in the Air Corps? Is not the Air Corps rather deficient in officers, and do they not have to utilize a number of reserve officers on active duty to carry out the 5-year program authorized by Congress some time ago?

Mr. COLLINS. They are using detailed officers in order to make up the shortage.

Mr. BRIGGS. How much is the shortage, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. COLLINS. They are about 300 below their full allotment.

Mr. BRIGGS. That was my impression.

Mr. COLLINS. But I do not think they are suffering. Of course, they have some pride in seeing their program completed. It is my judgment that the Air Corps is in excel-

lent shape. This appropriation, I understand, is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BRIGGS. It is not with a view of increasing the appropriation; but this is the question: My understanding is that under the 5-year program providing for the increased building of planes there has been an insufficient supply of regular commissioned officers, and the corps has had to call for active duty many reserve officers who have been trained by the Army at its own field schools. My thought is to ascertain whether provision is made for carrying on and utilizing the reserve officers on active duty, and, if there will be an adequate supply of officers, to give the Army a sufficient supply of officers as well as airplanes.

Mr. COLLINS. We are providing the money to continue the same policy that we have pursued in the past, and that policy will necessarily have to be continued, I am afraid, for a good many years to come, because the graduates of the Military Academy absorb all vacancies and leave practically no opportunity for the permanent appointment of graduate flying cadets. It does not appear that the Air Corps will be able to realize its full quota by depending wholly upon Military Academy graduates.

Mr. BRIGGS. Then where the academy is not able to turn out a sufficient number of officers the Air Corps should have the opportunity to turn to the reserve officers and put them on the active list and carry through their program just the same?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. In the language on page 33, where you refer to the purchase of new airplanes and their equipment and accessories, does that include the spare parts of a plane?

Mr. COLLINS. No. The spare parts this year are included in the item of \$9,130,100. Until this year in the purchase of planes the purchase item included not only the plane but spare engines and spare parts. The purchase item in this year's bill was built on a complete airplane without spares. The spare parts and extra engines are included in the \$9,130,100, which accounts for that figure appearing as having been materially increased.

Mr. GOSS. It does not change the policy at all?

Mr. COLLINS. Not at all.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

ARMY—MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants, for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships and transports, for laundry work for enlisted men and Army nurses while patients in a hospital, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone; for the purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; for inspection service and instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture which may be transferred in advance; for expenses of medical supply depots; for medical care and treatment not otherwise provided for, including care and subsistence in private hospitals of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, of applicants for enlistment, and of prisoners of war and other persons in military custody or confinement, when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furlough; for the proper care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof, and the payment of reasonable damages not otherwise provided for for bedding and clothing injured or destroyed in such prevention; for the care of insane Filipino soldiers in conformity with the act of Congress approved May 11, 1903 (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 198); for the pay of male and female nurses, not including the Army Nurse Corps, and of cooks and other civilians employed for the proper care of sick officers and soldiers, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignments, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War; for the pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; for the pay of other employees of the Medical Department; for the payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; for supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the enlisted force of the Medical Department; for the supply of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, \$1,495,976.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 2, strike out "\$1,095,976" and insert in lieu thereof, "\$1,271,471."

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have been as consistent as any man in this House in trying to carry out an economy program in every way that it is possible to do it, in this bill as well as in others, but I find that in this item there is a reduction of \$175,000 below what the War Department and General Patterson in his testimony say will be necessary to carry on. I understand also that the estimate he made for this bill is something like \$28,000 under what it was last year. I believe in economy, but I do not believe it is right to commence at the sick bed. You have passed many items where we could have stricken out many thousands of dollars, but I do believe in the instance here that we ought not to cut down at the sick bed and in our hospitals. The report shows that there were treated in the hospitals last year 291,000 persons. Not only is the item less than it was in last year's appropriation, but I think it ought to be a little bit more, for this reason: You are now completing four hospitals that must be equipped with necessary equipment in order to be used. Four of these hospitals will be ready for occupation very soon, I understand. The one I have particularly in mind is at Hot Springs, a 412-bed hospital, which will be ready for occupancy by the middle of this summer. Without the necessary funds to equip the hospital, General Patterson says, and those who know say, that it will be impossible to equip the hospital for use. It seems to me it will be penny foolishness to have great hospitals erected and not give a chance to equip them, so that they could be used. On that particular point about whether they could be occupied and furnished I desire to read a part of General Patterson's testimony that is in the hearings.

He says:

It is impossible to make a new hospital look presentable by moving into it furnishings and equipment that has already been used for years and has arrived at a stage when its usefulness is open to question or its repair and renovation of doubtful value economically. Inasmuch as Congress has authorized these buildings, it is fair to assume that it was the intention to appropriate sufficient funds to give them a presentable appearance and be so equipped as to function satisfactorily in the care of the sick.

In preparing this estimate the need for strict economy has been kept constantly in mind and no items have been included save those required under normal consumption and replacement. That is, no supplies have been estimated for above those that would go into the old hospitals which the new ones replace. In order to give them the necessary new equipment, without which they can not function, it will be imperative to limit replacements in our other hospitals and make them carry on with what is on hand until some future fiscal year. Therefore, it will be apparent to all that the funds asked for represent a minimum below which they can not be reduced without seriously crippling our hospital service, and thus the proper care of the sick and injured of the Army.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman is one of the ablest and most diligent Members of the House, and I would like to inquire how he is going to allot the amount provided in his amendment. Is it going to only one hospital in Arkansas?

Mr. GLOVER. Oh, no, it goes into all of them.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman must know when he offers an amendment which hospital needs the most.

Mr. GLOVER. I am relying on the testimony of the head man before the committee. I am putting into my amendment the exact figures given by General Patterson and others.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. BEEDY. Oh, let us make that 10 minutes. I do not think we ought to shut off debate on an important section like this.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEEDY) there were—ayes 27, noes 21.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, the committee has been just as fair with the Medical Corps of the Army as it is possible for the committee to be with any branch of the service. In the first place, we saw no reason why this appropriation should be increased over the present year. Therefore we started with the 1933 appropriation as a basis and then deducted the economy act savings, most of which are impounded, and the balance of the reductions are reductions that the Medical Corps itself has suggested in its justifications. In other words, if the Medical Corps had appropriated to it this year \$9,000, and they say they will spend for that activity next year \$8,000, we subtracted the \$1,000 from the 1933 allowance. That is all the committee has done. The committee took their reduction figures and added to them the economy act savings. I do not see that we are getting anywhere by sentimentalizing on this particular subject. I submit we have proceeded on a very fair basis and have done as well by the Medical Department as other activities of the Government, if not better.

Let us not forget the fact that this is not all the appropriation that is expendable by the Medical Corps of the Army. There will be \$2,243,000 that the Medical Corps will have for expenditure other than the amount appropriated in this bill. Those are funds that come to them through the Veterans' Administration and are expendable by them for any of their activities in any way they see fit. There has not been a single penny denied the Medical Corps for instruments or for medicines or any other objects estimated for by the Budget or by themselves.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GLOVER. Is it not true that the head of this department stated that the sum mentioned in my amendment is that which would be absolutely necessary in order to carry on under the terms of this bill for the next year? Do the hearings not show that?

Mr. COLLINS. If they do, should that preclude us from exercising our own judgment? I am not so certain, however, that the hearings contain such a statement.

Mr. GLOVER. Well, I say they do.

Mr. COLLINS. All the committee has done, if a man's salary was reduced because of the economy act \$100, we reduced this appropriation \$100. It was not expendable by them. Then any reduction that has been suggested by the Medical Corps itself we have eliminated. We have taken their justifications just as they gave them over to us.

There is not anybody here who is more solicitous of the medical welfare of the Army than the members of this subcommittee. I do not believe this House is in a mood to increase appropriations when the subcommittee has gone fully into the subject and by a unanimous vote of the committee, not only the subcommittee but the entire Committee on Appropriations, found that this was an ample sum. In addition to that, there is not an individual in this Congress who does not know that if the Medical Corps of the Army needed money, or needed any sum of money, this committee and this Congress would vote it unanimously to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine moves to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, there is a disposition here on important items to shut out anybody who wants five minutes to discuss them. We have spent only 10 minutes on this entire paragraph, and I was forced to make this preferential motion in order to have an opportunity to speak. I regret very much to have done so, but there is one phase of this problem that has not been brought to the attention

of the committee at all. The gentleman in charge of the bill knows very well that all former appropriation bills carried this provision, that—

Under the authorizations contained in the act, no issues of reserve supplies or equipment shall be made where such issues would impair the reserves held by the War Department for two field armies of 1,000,000 men.

Now, that provision is dropped out, and the appropriation for medical supplies is cut by more than \$175,000. Of the curtailed allowance \$652,000 is required to pay the medical personnel and maintain the Medical Supply Department. That leaves under this appropriation only \$443,000 for medical supplies.

For several years the Surgeon General has been drawing on reserve supplies, because insufficient funds have been appropriated to buy medicines and supplies to meet existing needs. I do not think General Patterson would write me and tell me this bill is going to cripple his department and make it impossible for him to take proper care of the Army's sick, unless it were a fact.

If he is forced to continue to draw on reserve supplies as he will be if this bill passes as it is, recourse must be had to depots where these medical reserve supplies are stored. Men must be found to break open the bales and the containers in which the medicine and supplies are packed. But, there is no personnel to do it. There is no personnel to transport these reserve supplies from the depots to the places where they are needed. There is no money to pay, even for the transportation of the supplies. Even if there were, the cost of paying the personnel to get the supplies and transport them to the hospitals where they are needed, would be fully more than the value of the medical supplies themselves.

Gentlemen, I am not interested in padding an appropriation. I want to cut everything to the bone, but here is a vital need which is blindly if not obstinately denied in this bill. We ought to go slowly, because if there is any part of the Army that should be looked after it is the men who are sick and wounded in hospitals and who need care. If you force the medical division to go to these depots scattered all over the country and open these bales and containers of reserve medical supplies and procure the personnel to transport them, I do not know how this department can do its work without creating a deficiency. General Patterson says you will break down his units and cripple the efficiency of his whole department. Let us not follow this short-sighted policy of cutting medical supplies for our Army. It is not right. Here is at least one place where we ought to call a halt on these unjustifiable cuts. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, let us see what some of the items are that the Medical Corps reduced themselves, so we can understand if the reduction is one that we may appropriately make. The first one of them here is under the heading of "Stationery," paper for printing, \$3,000. This \$3,000 reduction was shown in the justification. We eliminated this amount. The next item under "Stationery" is "Stationery other than printed forms and letterheads." That shows a minus of \$9,455. We took that off. The next item is cleaning and toilet supplies, \$7,000. We took that off, and so on through the list.

Now, when the justifications made by the Medical Bureau come to the committee with these reductions, with a statement by the bureau that they will need that much less for stationery in 1934 than they needed in 1933, is there any objection to accepting their statement on that? And these are just as much part of a statement from them as anything that appears in the hearings, because they are the justifications submitted to the committee.

I want to say to the membership of this House that in dealing with the Medical Corps we did not take off a penny as a result of the reduction in the prices of the commodities they purchase. Had we taken off of purchase items, which items are easily 30 per cent less than they were in 1932, we would have taken off twice as much as we have because of reduced commodity costs and given them the same quantity of supplies that they procured in 1932. We did not even do that. We merely took the economy act savings and added to the economy act savings reductions in certain items, like stationery, gasoline, letterheads, and so on, that are used in the Medical Department and added those reductions that they gave us in their justifications, together with the economy act savings. These added together and subtracted from the 1933 appropriation make the amount proposed in this bill. That is all there is to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maine to strike out the enacting clause.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, including research, planning, design, development, inspection, test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance material together with the machinery, supplies, and services necessary thereto; for supplies and services in connection with the general work of the Ordnance Department, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting, and computing machines, including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instruments of service; to provide for training and other incidental expenses of the ordnance service; for instruction purposes, other than tuition; for the purchase, completely equipped, of light trucks, at not to exceed \$750 each, and for maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn freight and passenger carrying vehicles; for ammunition for military salutes at Government establishments and institutions to which the issues of arms for salutes are authorized; for services, material, tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; for publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office, including subscriptions to periodicals; for necessary traveling expenses, not to exceed \$26,981; for services of not more than four consulting engineers, as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, at rates of pay to be fixed by him not to exceed \$50 per day for not exceeding 50 days each, and for their necessary traveling expenses, \$9,366,116: *Provided*, That \$180,000 of this appropriation shall be available exclusively for the purchase of convertible armored tanks.

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the language on page 40, beginning with the word "*Provided*" down to the end of the paragraph in line 3, on the ground, first, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and, second, it is an appropriation not authorized by law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is in doubt as to whether it is in order, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa levels his objection at the proviso only on the ground it is not authorized by existing law.

The Chair will notice that in the main body of the paragraph to which the proviso is appended there is authorization for the manufacture of ordnance material. It is within the scope of Congress to determine how much money shall be available for any character of ordnance material.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman will notice the language in the proviso is "for the purchase," not for the procurement, and you can not purchase from your own Ordnance Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. The paragraph provides for manufacture and procurement.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BARBOUR. This is almost the identical language that was carried in the bill last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course.

I directed attention in my former remarks to the fact that the paragraph provides for manufacture. It also provides the all-pervasive phrase of procurement for manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue of all kinds of ordnance material.

The proviso merely limits the amount of the appropriation that may be available for purchase of certain kinds of ordnance material.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If this is knocked out on a point of order, the Government goes into business to the extent of \$180,000, because the Government will manufacture the tanks, while the bill provides otherwise.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no escape from the logic of that position. "Procurement" is an all-pervasive term, and by virtue of its being in juxtaposition to the word "manufacture" it enlarges the term "manufacture," and means procurement by any means, including purchase, and even appropriation in time of war would be procurement.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield long enough to let the Chair rule on it?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not accept that impertinent remark of the gentleman from Arkansas, who ought to be supporting his bill rather than attacking it, because I asked the indulgence of the Chair to hear me.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not yield to the gentleman for such remarks. I am speaking by the indulgence of the Chair and not by the indulgence of his colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DRIVER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The authority to which the language contained in this bill evidently is directed is in section 1195 of the Code, in Title X, which provides that the Assistant Secretary of War shall cause to be manufactured or produced at the Government arsenals or Government-owned factories of the United States all such supplies or articles needed by the War Department, as said arsenals or Government-owned factories are capable of manufacturing or producing upon an economical basis.

The Chair is clearly of the opinion that the language contained in the proviso, to which the point of order is directed, enlarges the authority of the provision of law which the Chair has just read and therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 40, line 1, after "\$9,366,116," insert the following: "Provided, That \$100,000 of this appropriation shall be available exclusively for the procurement of convertible armored tanks."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to have a limitation to conform with existing law. This limitation does not involve new legislation, because the use of the word "procurement" is consistent with existing permanent law on this subject. I think some limitation should be put in. Eighty-five thousand dollars was recommended by the Director of the Budget for this particular purpose. Am I correct?

Mr. COLLINS. I think the gentleman's amendment is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe that if the Member who made the point of order against the language a few minutes ago had made his point of order against the amendment, it would also have been sustained. The language of this proposed amendment is clearly a camouflage; the extension

of authority and legislative jurisdiction in this amendment is just as great as it was in the language which was stricken from the bill on the point of order which was sustained.

If this Congress wants the Appropriations Committee to usurp the jurisdiction of the legislative committee, all right; then vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and earmark a part of the appropriation. If this Congress desires to earmark a certain portion of this appropriation so that it will be expended only for a certain kind of equipment for national defense to a single corporation, vote for the amendment. If you desire to earmark the appropriation or a specified portion of the appropriation so that it can not be expended for any other purpose than the purchase of Christie tanks, vote for the amendment. If you do not want to single out one individual manufacturer to receive a contract under a legislative rider on an appropriation bill, I urge you to vote against the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I know that he would not want to make a statement that was incorrect. But when the gentleman says that this amendment of mine is for the purpose of benefiting the Christie tanks, the gentleman misunderstands my intent and misinterprets it. Might I say that the purpose of my amendment was to prevent the \$80,000 being tied up in the \$180,000, so that it could be used to give men work at the various arsenals?

Let me say further with reference to the Christie tanks: The Christie Co. did not build all the tanks that were built last year. The American La France Co. built some. The Christie Co. did not build one. My amendment opens the provision to everyone, but they must give it to the arsenals if they have the facilities. If they have not, if they can not bid, there is open competition for everybody in private industry. But under the amendment they must give it to the arsenals if they have the facilities.

Mr. SCHAFER. Then why not strike out the whole limitation with reference to earmarking anything, and then the arsenals can have the whole amount of the appropriation? Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] used up two minutes of my time, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to criticize the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know what he is seeking to accomplish; but I know from following the debates, when the War Department appropriation bill was up at the last session of Congress, particularly the interjection into the debate by a Member of Congress representing the district in which these Christie tanks are manufactured, that it was the intent at that time to confine the tank expenditures to the Christie tanks alone. If the gentleman wants to go all the way down the line and say that all of this appropriation is to be expended for employees in the arsenals, then for goodness' sake withdraw your amendment and stop any earmarking for the Christie or any other tank.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. I reserve the right to object in order to propound a unanimous-consent request that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEEDY) there were—ayes 33, noes 26.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-six Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers. Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. BEEDY and Mr. COLLINS to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 27, noes 67.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present; and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is a quorum in the Chamber at this moment, and I ask the Chair to count.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members present, a quorum. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi to close debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GARBER] was on the floor and waived his right for the motion just carried. He is entitled to the floor if he is present. Not being present, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, there may have been some confusion in the minds of Members as to the purpose sought to be achieved by the point of order raised by the gentleman from Iowa. As the bill was reported by the committee with this proviso it would have permitted the purchase of tanks from private sources. The point of order being properly sustained, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] offered an amendment which is in accordance with existing law and would compel the War Department to first procure, if possible, the tanks from Government arsenals. There is no question that the law not only is very clear but the policy is definitely established by Congress that ordnance and war matériel, as such, must be procured from Government arsenals. I have risen to point out—especially in these days when we hear so much about Government in business and when there is a sort of drive going on in the House on the question—that it is the policy of our Government to keep the manufacturer of war matériel out of private hands.

It is a sound, wholesome policy, regardless of what one's views may be on Government operation or Government in business or otherwise. The whole trend of thought, the best thought of the world, is to take the profits out of war. This House passed a resolution creating a commission to study that very question. Why the report has never been called up I do not know, but the least we can do in the consideration of an appropriation for the War Department and appropriation for the Navy Department is to take away every incentive of profits. If we will take the incentive of profits from munitions and armaments of war, we may be able to legislate intelligently on a War and Navy Department appropriation bill.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In just a moment. Just follow the debate in the discussion of this appropriation bill and it will be seen that the subcommittee in charge has a more difficult time to protect its bill than any other subcommittee. Why? On account of the selfish local interests that creep in to in-

crease the appropriations, and, as I said earlier in the day, under the guise of patriotism and preparedness.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is one instance: The Army prepares plans for tanks and other ordnance. There is naturally only a limited demand; therefore such ordnance should be manufactured in arsenals, else the tendency to increase appropriations for increased purchases for increased profits. I submit the first step in carrying out our policy of maintaining world leadership in peace is on this appropriation bill, by taking every semblance of private profit out of the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. Has the Government in these arsenals the facilities for building tanks? Do they have the patents necessary, or are we going into a new socialistic movement of the Government going into the tank-constructing business?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In the first place, tanks must be built on Government specifications. Every bit of ordnance, every bit of material purchased for our Army and Navy, must be on Government specification. In the second place, if there are any privately owned patents, the Government has the power to take those patents and pay for them afterwards, so that there can be no justification on any question of patents at this time.

Mr. SCHAFER. Well, have we the facilities now?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Of course, the Government has the facilities. The Army is maintained for national defense and not for private profit. This is the time to carry out that policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLANCY: Page 39, line 12, strike out "\$750," and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500."

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to have to take any time of the House this afternoon, particularly because of the irritable mood and testy temper in which the House apparently is, but I wish to say that on the advice of the experts of the War Department I am convinced this \$750 motor-truck provision will do dreadful damage.

The \$277,000,000 which we are appropriating in this bill is rendered practically worthless by the fact that we have hamstrung the motor-transportation unit. Jealous potential enemy nations should rejoice in this proviso. Necessary trucks can not be purchased for \$750.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] finally admitted yesterday afternoon, upon the close and persistent questioning of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that it was his purpose to restrict for the next year the purchase price of motor trucks to \$750 and less. Only the Ford or Chevrolet cheap, light, small truck can be purchased for \$750, says Assistant Secretary of War Payne in a letter to me.

What do we face if we allow this proviso to become the law? I am sure the Senate will have the good sense to change that provision, but it is our duty to change it. I am making the record for the Senate as I have in similar past crises. If that \$750 limitation becomes the law, the War Department will have to come back to Congress in the deficiency bill this spring for motor trucks, because the War Department does not have the required number of trucks now. I am informed they need 1,764 of 2, 3, and 5 ton trucks. They need 636 trucks costing \$750 or less. They are using now too many old worn-out trucks of the World War. We have our antiaircraft force dependent upon trucks costing above \$750. You know the antiaircraft forces are necessary because of what is going on in China to-day. The Chinese have no aircraft defense and are at the mercy of Japanese bombers and aircraft.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. In just a moment.

Now, it is absolutely necessary to have these heavier trucks to carry the anti-aircraft men, the guns, the munitions, and the equipment to the point of attack and the zone the hostile force is threatening.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLANCY. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Can the gentleman state what is the tonnage capacity of the light truck which may be purchased at not to exceed \$750?

Mr. CLANCY. Three-quarters of a ton or less, according to Assistant Secretary of War Payne.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What is the tonnage capacity of that truck?

Mr. CLANCY. Three-quarters of a ton or less.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. No; I can not yield further.

Now, this is the most dangerous provision in this bill, in my opinion. God help our national defense if the Senate does not undo the work of this committee. It is too bad the Democrats of this House feel they have an obligation to support the gentleman from Mississippi in his attitude.

The letter of Assistant Secretary of War Payne to me is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1933.

HON. ROBERT H. CLANCY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLANCY: Your attention is invited to the following provision appearing in lines 16 to 18, on page 22, of the War Department appropriation bill (H. R. 14199) for the fiscal year 1934:

"* * * the cost of any such vehicle so procured not to exceed \$750, including the value of any vehicle exchanged. * * *

The limitation as to cost imposed in the provision referred to above is an unwarranted and unjustifiable restriction upon the responsibility of the Secretary of War in procuring motor vehicles for the Army within the limits authorized by the law. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is provided for in the bill referred to for the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles but the wording restricts the cost of any such vehicles so procured to \$750. This limits these vehicles to the light $\frac{3}{4}$ -ton commercial truck of the Ford and Chevrolet type, and will not permit the procurement of any vehicles of greater tonnage capacity now required for the Army to replace as far as may be possible within the limits of the \$150,000, the antiquated and worn-out vehicles that have been on hand, maintenance of which has reached unjustifiable proportion.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. PAYNE,
The Assistant Secretary of War.

Yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], who is in charge of this bill, criticized me severely for fighting this proviso and tried to draw a herring across the trail by stating the motor-truck companies should favor his proviso. He declared Detroit should be notified of my action.

I made him the complete answer that representatives of the national association which speaks for motor-truck and passenger automobiles had indorsed my attitude. Now I present a telegram sent me to-day from one of the best-known motor-truck manufacturers in the country, M. L. Pulcher, of Detroit, president of the Federal Motor Truck Co., and he indorses and strengthens my arguments.

It is as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., January 21, 1933.

HON. ROBERT H. CLANCY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Believe limitation of \$750 per truck proposed for War Department appropriations bill against best interests of the Nation. Small vehicles coming within such price limit obviously could not perform under all requirements of War Department. The department should be permitted to buy vehicles according to specifications adopted by them for specific purchases. Open competition on purchases will keep prices very low, as investigation of recent Government purchases in various departments will prove.

M. L. PULCHER,
President Federal Motor Truck Co.

Yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows some of my figures transposed, with reference to cuts made by the com-

mittee in Army transportation recommendations. I am informed the committee cut Army transportation \$2,021,978, and that the cut on motor transportation is \$768,845, or \$250,000 for motor maintenance.

Therefore, when the War Department is told that it might buy some trucks out of savings, it is mockery, because savings are made impossible by the drastic cuts.

Further, the gentleman from Mississippi insists that I am in error about Cabinet members being restricted in the use of their official automobiles, in the original language of the appropriation bills last year.

I believe the first language of this sort was submitted by Mr. COLLINS as an amendment to the Agriculture bill on January 26, 1932, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date on page 2757.

The description is as follows:

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

"On page 88, line 6, after the word 'him,' insert the following: 'Provided further, That no part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for purchasing any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle (except busses and station wagons) at a cost, delivered and completely equipped for operation, in excess of \$750, including the value of a vehicle exchanged where exchange is involved; nor shall any money appropriated herein be used for maintaining, driving, or operating any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes, and 'official purposes' shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment. This limitation as to price shall not apply to any motor vehicle purchased for official use of the Secretary of Agriculture.'"

I criticized this language and declared it prevented a Cabinet member from using his official auto from his domicile to his office and back. I said that if it went into the White House appropriation bill it would prevent the President from using his official auto between the White House and his Rapidan camp, which was also his occasional home and office.

The Comptroller General, Mr. McCarl, confirmed me in this legal interpretation.

Then later the language was changed and the Cabinet members, including the Secretary of War, were made exempt from these drastic provisions in succeeding appropriation bills.

The House will find that I am correct and am following the part of wisdom and promoting the general welfare by denouncing the \$750 truck limitation.

I also am hopeful that the Senate will change this language before irreparable damage is done to our national defense and particularly to our soldiers and civilians whose lives will be at stake in a national emergency.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLANCY) there were ayes 28 and noes 46. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GLOVER: On page 39, in line 24, after the word "exceed," strike out "\$50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY OF MILITARY ACADEMY

Cadets: For pay of cadets, \$964,080: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, no officer of the Army shall be entitled to receive any increase in pay or allowances because of detail or assignment to duty in any capacity at the Military Academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Will the chairman of the subcommittee inform the committee of the reason for the limitation limiting the officers

in the matter of any increase of pay or allowances because of detail to the academy?

Mr. COLLINS. It is just a question of carrying this language or allowing these men detailed at West Point to go into the Court of Claims and sue for what they claim they are entitled to under the national defense act.

At the instance of the General Accounting Office this language is carried in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any language in the national defense act that gives warrant for their making a claim for increased pay by reason of detail to the Military Academy?

Mr. COLLINS. No; in fact the national defense act specifically provides:

Hereafter no detail, rating, or assignment of an officer shall carry any advanced rank except as otherwise specifically provided herein. * * *

The rest is irrelevant, I might say to the gentleman; but the Court of Claims has held that the provision I have cited does not repeal a number of old statutes that permit an increase of pay to persons assigned to duty at West Point. Therefore, in order to cure the effects of that decision this language is carried.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of National Guard (armory drills), \$15,867,385, of which \$2,000,000 shall be available immediately.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: On page 47, after line 6, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or travel, or other expense of any officer or enlisted man of the National Guard or the Organized Reserves who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States for disability rated by the Veterans' Administration in excess of 20 per cent, except that this limitation shall not apply to the adjutants general of the several States."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman state the ground of his point of order?

Mr. GOSS. I make the point of order that it is not germane; that in the disguised form of a limitation it carries legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman's sole objection seems to be to the language. He takes the position that it is legislation in disguised form. It is a limitation, pure and simple. It limits the expenditure of this money, as to whom it can be paid and to whom it can not be paid.

Mr. GOSS. The Organized Reserves are not in the National Guard, I may say to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I understand, but they are in this bill.

Mr. GOSS. It is out of order in this section; this is my point; it is not germane to the section.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If the Chair rules against me, then I will modify my amendment by striking out the reserves. In fact, that part is not necessary, as the War Department will not accept a man noted as disabled in the reserve corps. As soon as he is recognized by the Veterans' Bureau, he is removed from the reserves.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to modify his amendment?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I modify the amendment by striking out the words "or the Organized Reserves."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as indicated.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: On page 47, after line 6, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling or other expense of any officer or enlisted man of the National Guard who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States for disability rated by the Veterans' Administration in excess of 20 per cent, except that this limitation shall not apply to the adjutants general of the several States."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If I explain the amendment to the gentleman, I am sure he will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGON. Did the Chair rule as to whether or not the point of order of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss] was well taken?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not, because there was a modification of the original amendment offered and a point of order is now reserved by the gentleman from Connecticut on the modified amendment, which is now pending.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I want to have an opportunity to tell the gentleman from Connecticut what this amendment means. I will settle the point of order later.

A brief investigation on my part discloses already there are 65 men on the emergency officers' retired roll getting money from the United States Government amounting to from \$125 to \$200 a month, who in order to get on this roll must show that they are more than 30 per cent disabled, who are serving in some capacity with the National Guard and drawing money out of this appropriation. If they are disabled, they are entitled under the law to be on the emergency officers' retired roll, but they are not entitled to be serving in the National Guard. If a man is disabled, he should not be in the guard. If he is not disabled, he has no moral right to accept pay as a disabled man.

Mr. RAGON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RAGON. I am, of course, in hearty sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, but I am just wondering why the gentleman provided that the disability must be not exceeding 20 per cent. Why does the gentleman put a limit upon it?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I put a limit in the amendment because in some instances you will find a man received some wounds in combat and was temporarily incapacitated. He is perhaps sufficiently recovered so that he may be only 10 or 12 per cent disabled and may be drawing \$8 or \$10 a month. A man who has been wounded or injured in line of duty and is only 10 or 12 per cent disabled is still a fighter. I would exempt him. He deserves to be exempted.

Mr. RAGON. I may say to my friend that I think he is absolutely correct, but I believe he is making it possible, under this amendment, to permit every man who is what we commonly classify as 25 per cent disabled to come in under the amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. How can he come in under the amendment when the limit is 20 per cent?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. RAGON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RAGON. As I understand it, there has been a recent decision by the Veterans' Bureau to the effect that no longer can they combine certain degrees of disability to constitute a 25 per cent disability, and a man must have a disability now on one particular claim of 19 per cent, I believe it is.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am willing for the gentleman to amend the amendment, if he desires.

Mr. RAGON. I think the gentleman should amend it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I think the amendment should be adopted in some form so as to prevent a man who is on the emergency officers' retired list from drawing money

under this appropriation for active service. In my State—while I do not know who the gentleman is, I know he must be a real fighter, and I greatly respect him, because his wounds were received in the line of duty—there is a man who is 84 per cent disabled, according to the Veterans' Bureau, yet he is serving in the National Guard. His patriotism can not be questioned. He is a fighter, although 84 per cent disabled, but I think all will agree he does not belong in the National Guard.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman's amendment includes the enlisted man, too, does it not?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It takes in enlisted men who are drawing money from the Government based on their sworn statement that they are disabled.

I have nothing but the greatest respect for the National Guard. It has proven in many instances its value in time of emergency.

I would do nothing that would interfere with its efficiency. The guard can depend upon my support at all times; but, Mr. Chairman, those I want to reach are especially the emergency retired officers whose sworn application required a statement that they were 30 or more per cent disabled. The men who are drawing a big monthly allowance who are in the guard—and it is my understanding that they also must pass a physical examination to get in the guard. Now, they are either disabled or they are not disabled. If disabled, I again say they do not belong in the guard; and if they are not disabled, they should not be receiving any benefits from the Government.

My limited investigation already shows 65 National Guard officers on the emergency officers' retired list. Massachusetts has the largest number, 19; New York has 5, Maryland 4, and my own State 3.

I have not checked on the enlisted man so far, but in Arkansas I do know 10 National Guard officers are drawing compensation from the Veterans' Bureau. This should be stopped.

My amendment should be adopted.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the members of the committee would consider some of the effects of this amendment. The situation should be cured, I will say to my good friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], by legislation carefully considered and reported by the appropriate legislative committee. This House is reaching such a stage that we might as well abolish all legislative committees, because of the usurpation of the authority and the jurisdiction of the legislative committees by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield.

Mr. BARBOUR. These amendments are not offered by members of the Appropriations Committee. They are offered by other Members of the House.

Mr. SCHAFER. I understand that; but if the House continually adopts these legislative amendments on appropriations, we might just as well save some clerk hire and other expenses by abolishing the regular legislative committees.

Let us see what this amendment does. It will disrupt the National Guard, and permit a gross discrimination against disabled war veterans and in favor of disabled members of the National Guard who had no war service or disabilities.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It will disrupt the National Guard?

Mr. SCHAFER. I will explain the reason for that statement.

There is no one in the House who knows more about veterans' disabilities and percentages of veterans' disabilities and about the work of the Veterans' Bureau than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. The gentleman has fought night and day to see that the disabled veterans get what they are entitled to under the law, and that they do not get any more than they are entitled to.

Let us see what will be the result of the adoption of this amendment. The gentleman's amendment does not take into consideration whether or not a disability or disease is rated permanent or temporary. For instance, at the present time some of the finest men we have in the National Guard are those who had experience in actual service during the World War. Let us consider a World War veteran who is an enlisted man. He may have a service-connected disability or disease from the World War, but it has not existed to a ratable degree for a number of years, which has not prohibited him from performing his service in the National Guard and would not interfere in any way in the performance of duty should the National Guard have been called into active Federal service.

He becomes a part and parcel of the National Guard establishment. Many disabilities and diseases come and go. He goes into the hospital and is there temporarily, only for two or three weeks, because of a temporary flare-up in his service disability. Are you going to deny the man the right to continue in the National Guard service because for this brief period his service-connected disability or disease carries a Veterans' Administration rating of more than 20 per cent?

You Members who handle veterans' cases know that in many cases disabilities and diseases are here to-day and not here to-morrow, particularly those rated on a temporary basis. A year ago a man may have had a 55 per cent disability, yet to-day, when the Veterans' Administration examines him, his diseased condition has subsided and it may be shown to exist and be rated as less than 10 per cent.

The gentleman from Missouri means well but fails to see what the effect will be. If the gentleman from Missouri wants to bring in this legislation, let him introduce a bill to cover the entire situation, and let the Committee on Military Affairs consider and report legislation which will not be so discriminatory against members of the National Guard who had active Federal military service.

Of course, officers or enlisted men permanently disabled by reasons of chronic conditions ought not to be in the National Guard, whether or not they are Veterans' Administration beneficiaries. Under this amendment such personnel which had no active war service or service-connected disabilities, would be able to continue, but those who had, who are a small percentage of the total, would be kicked out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, will move to rise after the disposition of this amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection.

The request of Mr. COLLINS was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, the policy of this Government is to build up a National Guard for the National defense. You can not do it when men and officers are unable to take the field. Let me say that every officer in the National Guard signs a statement that he is physically able to perform the military duties required of him. If he is drawing disability allowance or a pension or emergency officer's retirement pay, he certifies in that statement in substance that he is not able to engage in military duty because of disability. No man should be in the service who is physically unable to perform the duties required of him, and no man knows what day he may be called into service, who is an officer in the guard.

It is abhorrent to me to think that an officer—I do not care who he is—whether in the United States Army, National Guard, or Reserve Corps, would make a statement that he is able to perform military duty, and then, for the

sake of getting a small pension, say he is physically disabled. This is a good amendment, and I shall support it.

Now, as to the 20 per cent disability. If a man has lost his finger in the war he is allowed 10 per cent disability, but he is able to perform military duty, so that there should be a small percentage allowed, but it should stop there.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Would not 25 per cent be nearer right than 20 per cent?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Twenty per cent or 25 per cent is all right.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. This is the same policy that the Regular Army officers apply to the reserve officers, is it not?

Mr. BULWINKLE. If there is any disability whatsoever, a man can not be an officer in the active service in the Regular Army or Reserve Corps.

Mr. GOSS. Has the gentleman any idea as to why adjutant generals for the several States are excepted in this case?

Mr. BULWINKLE. As a usual thing—and I take it I am speaking for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]—it is understood that these men will not go into the field. They are administrative officers.

Mr. GOSS. Is it not a fact that some of these adjutant generals are paid a salary?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They are paid by the State; yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The adjutant general is appointed by the governor of the State. That is why I have covered them in the amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Why does the gentleman except them?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Because they are appointed by the governors and are administrative officers. I think we should leave them alone; let the governors be responsible.

Mr. SCHAFER. If you do not want any cripples in the National Guard, why not draw your regulations to say that no one shall be in the National Guard who has any disability whatever?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, when he suggests this would disrupt the guard, that if, as he says, there are thousands and thousands of officers in the guard who are drawing compensation, allowance, or pay, then it is time to disrupt the guard; and in answer to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, under the law no one who is physically or mentally disabled can be in the service as enlisted man or officer.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSS to the amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: After the word "per cent" strike out the balance "except that this limitation shall not apply to the adjutants general of the several States."

Mr. RAGON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAGON. I think I was incorporated in the gentleman's suggestion to have five minutes.

Mr. GOSS. But I was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. RAGON. The gentleman was recognized to introduce his amendment.

Mr. GOSS. I understood the Chair recognized me.

Mr. RAGON. Only to introduce an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Arkansas who yielded to the gentleman from North Carolina. The gentleman from Connecticut said that he had an amendment to offer and the Chair recognized him for the purpose of offering the amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman, therefore, is unquestionably entitled to be heard on his amendment for the remaining time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is this. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has any merit at all, certainly my amendment has more merit, because it does not except anyone in the National Guard, including the adjutant generals of the various States.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. The reason why the adjutant generals of the States are excepted is because they are civilian officers, appointed by the governors of the State and paid by the State.

Mr. GOSS. But very often retired officers or reserve officers might come in under this limitation, and that is why I am offering the amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. When the adjutant general of the State of New York is in active service during an encampment he is the highest paid military officer in the whole world. He gets the pay of a major general of his State and he gets the pay of a major general of the United States.

Mr. GOSS. Then the gentleman is in favor of my amendment?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the agreement already entered into, to address the House for two minutes, because there has been a new phase injected into this discussion in the last five minutes, and there is something that ought to be brought out. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PATTERSON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the paragraph. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both amendments be again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the pending amendments.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATTERSON) there were, ayes 51 and noes 2.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARKER of Georgia to the amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: Strike out the word "twenty," and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten," so that the line will read, "for a disability rated by the Veterans' Administration in excess of 10 per cent."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KVALE) there were, ayes 45 and noes 17.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER) there were ayes 59 and noes 5.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DRIVER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 14199, the War Department appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE AERIAL LAW
(S. DOC. NO. 175)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an appropriation in the sum of \$3,500 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Third International Conference on Private Aerial Law to be held in Rome, Italy, in 1933.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 1933.

ANNUAL REPORT, ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN (H. DOC. NO. 425)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 6 of the trading with the enemy act, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Alien Property Custodian on proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act for the year ended December 31, 1932.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 1933.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT
APPOINTED FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The Speaker laid before the House a communication from the Secretary of State transmitting certified photostat copy of a certificate of the final ascertainment of electors of President and Vice President of the United States appointed for the State of New Mexico on November 8, 1932.

TERMS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF
CONGRESS

The Speaker laid before the House a communication from the Governor of Montana announcing the ratification by that State of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing of time of assembling of Congress.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I have sent to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been advised by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MOREHEAD], chairman of the Memorial Services Committee, that the gentleman desires to submit to-day a resolution providing for a date for the memorial services. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 362

Resolved, That on Friday, February 17, 1933, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials under the provisions of clause 40a of Rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall be given the privilege of extending their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL—
FISCAL YEAR 1934

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 14363, Rept. No. 1890)

making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

GRAZING FEES IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 517, authorizing the fixing of grazing fees on lands within national forests be rereferred from the Committee on Public Lands to the Committee on Agriculture. I have consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and he agrees that this rereference should be made.

Mr. SNELL. What is the subject matter of the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES. It is with respect to grazing fees in the national forests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION OF VETERANS

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by myself before the American Institute of Homeopathy on the subject of hospitalization for veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by myself before the American Institute of Homeopathy, Washington, D. C., June 13, 1932:

Soon after entering Congress in December, 1927, I was placed on the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee and assigned to the subcommittee on hospitalization of World War veterans. Hearings before the committee revealed that requests were coming from nearly every State in the Union for the construction of large veterans' hospitals.

The Veterans' Bureau hospitals, of which there were about 50 at that time, comprised about 22,000 beds. These included beds for neuropsychiatric, general medical and surgical, and tubercular cases. Most of these hospitals were public and private institutions before they were taken over by the Government at the close of the war to be used as veterans' hospitals as emergency institutions for the sick and disabled of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

It was fortunate for the Government that these buildings were available for use with little remodeling or changing. The time needed to acquire sites, construct buildings, and purchase equipment for hospitals is about four years; you can readily see the great advantage of securing these buildings in semiconstructed stages at least when they were so urgently needed.

The large number of tubercular cases seemed to call for special hospital construction at once, and accordingly Aspinwall, in Pennsylvania; Johnson City, Tenn.; White Plains, N. Y.; Denver, Colo.; Mount Alto, Calif.; and several others were immediately authorized and built.

During this time many patients were cared for in contract hospitals. There were many complaints, both from the patients and from the hospitals, with this type of treatment.

From 1920 to 1930 the expansive program of the country was not confined to business blocks, manufacturing plants, and public and private buildings, but it spread likewise to hospital construction, and in 1930 we had in the United States 955,869 beds, an increase of 48,736 over 1929. Of the beds in general hospitals, 64 per cent were occupied in 1930, while 65.5 per cent were occupied in 1929. The nervous and mental hospitals had a much higher percentage of occupancy, being 94.8 per cent in 1930, as compared with 64.7 per cent in the general hospitals.

These nervous and mental hospitals are usually filled to capacity. They include Federal, State, county, and municipal as Government owned; and church, industrial, individual, partnership, and independent associations as non-Government owned. The occupancy in these hospitals of both classes is on the increase, there being 19,653 more patients last year than the year before. It is conservatively estimated that by 1935 more than a half million beds will be needed for this type of patient.

Institutions for the care of nervous and mental cases are usually of much larger capacity than hospitals for other cases, and are capable of a higher percentage of occupancy, as many of the patients are able to be up and out of doors. They usually have extensive grounds, many of them have farms, upon which the more able patients do a great deal of labor and reduce their cost of maintenance considerably.

Coming again to the veterans' hospital problem, it has been the policy of the Government to care for all veterans suffering from disabilities incurred or aggravated in the military or naval service in time of war.

In 1924 sections 202-210 of the World War veterans' act, as amended, provided that in veterans' hospitals, if beds were available, they should be used for non-service-connected cases, caring only for certain specified types of cases. In 1926 this was amended further to permit the treatment of every type of case.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in a letter to me, under date of January 21, 1931, said: "I have read with considerable interest your speech before the House, as reported by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday, January 17, 1931, having to do with the policy of future hospital construction for veterans of the World War. I believe that your statement in this connection will be most helpful in informing Members of Congress of our problem in this matter, and I hope it will aid in expediting its solution."

"During the past several months we have experienced a greater demand for hospital beds than we had beds available, but, as I know you are aware, this demand has not emanated essentially from veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities, but rather from those veterans who are suffering from disabilities which have no relation to their military service."

The American Medical Association, through its bulletin of November, 1931, discusses the problem of medical and hospital service for veterans suffering from diseases and injuries not of service origin, as follows:

"Justice demands that the Federal Government give needed care to veterans disabled by military service. The Federal Government is now, however, providing medical and hospital care in hospitals established and maintained by the Federal Government to veterans, rich and poor alike, suffering from disabilities that are admittedly in no way connected with military service. It is apparently the policy of the Federal Government to extend this service until every veteran everywhere in the United States who is suffering from any disability whatever will be given hospital care at the expense of Federal taxpayers in Federal hospitals constructed for that purpose and by a corps of salaried physicians in the Federal service. To that policy the American Medical Association, through its house of delegates, has declared its opposition. The association believes that the creation and maintenance of governmental medical services for the treatment of sick and injured persons who are financially able to provide for themselves tend to enlarge bureaucracy, to debase the quality of medical service rendered, to destroy the initiative of the individual physician, and in proportion to the size of the governmental service created to deter competent persons from entering the medical profession."

"Because, however, of the failure of long-continued efforts on the part of the American Medical Association to procure the abandonment of this policy by the Federal Government, the house of delegates at its session in Philadelphia in June last adopted a resolution looking toward the treatment of veterans suffering from non-service-connected injuries by physicians practicing in their own communities and in local hospitals, the Federal Government paying to the sick or injured veteran a reasonable allowance to enable him to provide himself with such medical or hospital services. The plan proposed would make it easier for veterans to obtain needed treatment without leaving their homes and would solve the problem that the Federal Government must ultimately face if it persists in its present policy—that is, the problem of what to do with the many Federal hospitals and with the large Federal corps of physicians necessary to man them, when veterans die off, as they must do in the course of time."

Early in the Seventy-first Congress, I introduced a resolution calling for a general survey of all the hospital facilities in the United States. This resolution was not acted upon. I made a survey of my own district, and soon afterward the American Hospital Association adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, That the trustees of the American Hospital Association, in interest of the veterans, and also for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary expense to the country and the public in general, earnestly recommended to the Veterans Bureau, the veterans' organizations, the Congress, and all others having the welfare of the veterans at heart, a consideration of the facilities for the care of injuries and acute illnesses offered by available civilian general hospitals under conditions similar to those now enjoyed by veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities, and further recommend that action be taken so that the use of available civilian hospitals, with provision for proper medical care, be the privilege of all veterans requiring general hospital treatment."

Following the adoption of this resolution the association sent out a questionnaire to each of the nearly 7,000 hospitals. One thousand nine hundred and thirty-two responded, with a total of 30,667 beds available for the care of sick and disabled veterans.

There are more than 130,000 empty beds in the general hospitals in the United States to-day. The average cost of maintaining a bed unoccupied is practically \$3 per diem, or it is costing the taxpayers of the United States \$390,000 per day, or \$140,400,000 per year to have on hand this extra number of beds. Now, who pays for them, and how is this money raised? In just three ways: State aid, which means the taxpayer; community chest or hospital drives, which means again the taxpayer; and lastly, if the taxpayer goes into the hospital as a patient he pays his way. So with the exception of certain endowment funds the taxpayer is the one who maintains all these unused and unnecessary beds.

My thought on this matter is simply that, if and when Congress determines its policy as to who shall be hospitalized, then

the Veterans' Administration should coordinate its policy along with the American Hospital Association in order that there may be no duplication of effort and no tremendous waste of the taxpayer's money in building and maintaining hospitals.

I have no complaint against the Veterans' Administration in its building program thus far, since many of its institutions are of the neuropsychiatric type. These are the ones which will be most in demand in the near future, but I do feel that an attempt should be made to utilize the facilities that are now being offered in our splendid general hospitals before we launch any great building program on the part of the Federal Government.

Under date of May 4, 1932, General Hines advised me as follows:

"The records of the Veterans' Administration indicate that since March 3, 1919, there has been authorized under eight general acts \$113,327,000 for new hospital construction. Of this amount \$97,450,000 has been appropriated. There has also been authorized by special acts covering individual projects the sum of \$9,425,000 for new construction at soldiers' homes, of which \$7,425,000 has been appropriated."

"Further, there has been expended since 1923 about \$15,000,000 from regular fiscal funds for permanent improvements and extensions to veterans' hospitals."

Most of the ex-service men would prefer to be hospitalized near their homes, where they can be visited frequently by friends, and where in many cases they can be treated by their own physicians. Then again the traveling expense, amounting to something like \$3,000,000 per year, will be practically eliminated under this plan.

I would maintain the diagnostic centers for the problem cases, since there are many of them; also certain special cases should be treated in special hospitals, but the average case of the average veteran may be treated just as well in his local hospital, by his local physician or surgeon, as he can be treated in the Veterans' Administration hospital by the Veterans' Administration physicians.

The average cost of constructing a veterans' hospital is \$3,500 per bed, and the moment a bed is made available, whether occupied or not, it immediately costs the taxpayers of the country \$3 per day for its maintenance.

We have been talking economy and trying in many ways to effect economies in our Federal expenditures, but I want to say to you fellow practitioners, men and women from every State in the Union, men and women who pay Federal taxes, and men and women who think, here is one place where we can economize and yet give better service. We have more than \$3,400,000,000 invested in our hospitals. Very little or less than 8 per cent of it is earning a penny for its stockholders. They have nothing except the comfort of a philanthropic duty performed. This represents more money than is invested in the lumber, paper, or printing industries. When the present program is completed, or now, as more beds are needed, I would have hospitals in every State, and in the larger States several, designated as hospitals for the care of veterans. Here they would be treated as any other patient, except that the Federal Government would pay the per diem rate, as set up in the particular hospital.

The records which are most important in veterans' cases would be handled by a representative from the regional office of the Veterans' Administration, who would make weekly or biweekly visits to the various hospitals designated. It would be his duty to see that proper notations were made on the folders as the cases progressed, and on discharge from the hospital see that the proper rating was established and the veteran advised accordingly. In this way, acting as contact officer, many of the unnecessary delays and inequalities now existing could be eliminated, and the veterans as a class would have much better service.

Now, to summarize, in the words of the American Hospital Association: "We want every sick and disabled veteran cared for promptly in the hospital of his choice and near his home and family."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—STAMP MONEY

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there never was a time when there should be more determined concerted action on the part of everyone in Congress and out to solve our momentous problems, and yet it seems this Congress is to follow the precedents of the past by bringing the legislative seine to shore with a "water haul" and without even a "farm relief" minnow. I am so discouraged over the awful plight of our farmers and people generally and the refusal of Congress to render any real relief. The farmers and common folks have many real friends here, but their every effort for real relief legislation is speedily overcome by the enemies of the honest men, women, and children who are struggling for the chance to make an honest living. The people are pleading for the chance to live and are begging Congress to act and not wait until every home has been sold and our citizens enslaved beyond redemption. Our people are seeking relief in every way possible. Almost every day I get letters from farmers of my district and from other States either indorsing my fight for them or suggesting some plan of relief which often is far superior to those of men elected to serve here in these halls. A few days ago

I received such a letter from a good friend of mine, Mr. J. A. Waters, of route No. 2, box 20, Jesup, Ga., from which I quote as follows:

Why can't the Government issue certificates and distribute them through the post office to help the farmer; say \$50 to the 1-horse farmer and \$100 to 2-horse farmer. Let every man that trades a one dollar bill put a 2 or 3 cent stamp on it until it gets its value in stamps on it and then let the Government redeem them at the post office. A billion dollars this way would save millions of homes.

This is a much better suggestion than that offered by many who want to use this method to raise money to be indiscriminately donated to the rich and poor alike.

At this time I would vote for any reasonable, or even extreme, method of raising money to save the homes of our farmers. God knows there is no reasonable extent I would not gladly go for them.

The plan of Mr. Waters to provide a considerable amount of money for each farmer would only be returning to the farmers what has been unjustly taken from them. The farmer has never received a square deal, and this would only be the restoration of stolen property.

Then, again, the Federal expenditure of this or even a larger amount of money to save our farmers and Nation would be justified to the fullest extent. I would not support the scheme advocated by some, to hand \$10 to every person and then raise the amount by a stamp or sales tax, because it is dangerous from every standpoint. A \$10 donation to the poor is too small to do any real good and is not at all commensurate with the burdens which this kind of a sales tax would at once place on the poorest of the poor throughout our country. Ten dollars to each farmer or to each member of his family would not stop the sale of his land very long, if at all, would soon be gone, and leave saddled on the farmer and his folks forever the worse sales tax ever conjured by the mind of man. To tax an enormous amount of money out of the poor by this system—as is now suggested by many as a method to stop the depression and bring back prosperity—and donate \$10 to each of the extremely rich is absurd and ridiculous in the extreme and not at all in the interest of the average man.

Dangerous as this system of taxation is, I would support it as a last resort to raise money to aid our farmers, as suggested by Mr. Waters. I would not vote for this sales tax, though, to raise money to donate to the rich or to relieve great wealth of all taxes or to pay all Government expenses, including extravagant postal bounties of nearly \$100,000,000 to the newspapers and periodicals of the country, as is now advocated by some of the editors who are the recipients of this identical outrageous newspaper graft.

I am willing to go the limit to help the farmers but would exert every other possible means to raise money in their behalf before I would sanction a Federal sales tax in any form. The big interests are most anxious to get a Federal sales tax forced on our people so the rich can be relieved of all income, inheritance, estate, and other taxes on wealth.

Many good men throughout the country, seeking for some form of relief, and being busy with the cares of the farm or other activities of making a living, are apt to be led into feeling that this stamp sales tax is all right because it is tied on to a proper use of the money to be raised by this particular method. I can not for the life of me though see how any man who claims to have spent much time studying such matters and to be an expert in such matters can at all be misled in this respect.

The danger of all these stamp sales tax schemes is in the method of raising revenue here sought to be set up.

Let us for the present forget the way the money is to be used—which may be either good or bad—and study this scheme for extracting money from the public. It puts a tax on spending money in cash—not by check—and thus encourages hoarding, relieves the wealthy who buy in large amounts or on a credit and pay with checks, and puts the entire burden on the poorest of the poor who have no money in the bank, who buy and pay for a small amount at a time, and who have been bled white and now are dying because of the outrages of the very crowd this scheme would relieve

of all taxes. This sales tax stamp plan is the most effective tax ever conjured up to put the whole burden on the poor and absolutely none on the rich.

The poor man buying medicine for his sick child with the last dollar he has on earth would pay 2 per cent tax; the rich man could buy the whole drug store and give a check and pay no tax. The poor man with only \$10 who wanted to get a 5-cent bowl of soup would have to pay 20 cents tax on a 5-cent purchase to get his soup; the rich could invite all his rich friends to a banquet of wine and costly foods costing thousands of dollars, settle with a check, and pay absolutely no tax.

The poor would pay a double tax under this system. The rich would not accept one of these stamp-tax dollars without the poor man paying the tax and then the rich man would make the poor man pay the tax again when he got it back. The poor would be taxed when they get the money and taxed when they pay it out. Some one may suggest that the poor man should be willing to pay this amount of tax or interest for the use of money. Let us see about this; the poor man, under this tax plan, gets a dollar bill and in five minutes pays it out and pays 4 per cent for the use of his own money five minutes. The rich banker gets some one else's money for a whole year—spends it as often as he pleases and pays the same 4 per cent for the use of the money. The poor man would be paying over one hundred and five thousand one hundred and twenty times as much for the use of his own money, as the rich banker would pay for the use of borrowed money. As the little boy says, "This is no fair."

It is said that practically all taxes are finally passed on to and paid by the poor, except inheritance and estate taxes; but this iniquitous stamp sales tax would be the only tax absolutely levied on the poor and no one else. If all the lawyers of all the earth were hired to work out a tax, all on the poor and none on the rich, surely their rich clients would be most highly pleased if they presented this sales-tax-stamp scheme.

No wonder many of the rich groups are now urging that this method be used in the raising of all revenues and that all taxes on the great corporations and wealth be at once removed. It is urged that this tax would raise the amount of money issued under this scheme in 12 months or less and that the poor would pay it and never know it. Well, the poor would pay it, but they would know it, and feel like hanging the man who forced it on them, after they tried it a year. This scheme would put the tax on the poor man because he keeps his money in circulation and helps his fellow man and would relieve from taxes the rich man who hides his money away and lets the whole people suffer because of an insufficient circulation of currency.

This scheme would tax the poor man who by hard labor earns a few dollars and spends it to save from hunger and cold his wife and babies and relieve from taxes the rich international banker and Wall Street broker who steals his million, hoards it, and wrecks a nation and helps cause the awful misery and suffering so evident everywhere at this awful hour.

The manufacturers' sales tax as a Federal policy is about to be forced on us over the bitter protest of many of us who believe it is vicious, unfair, and even criminal, and yet it would be a blessing as compared to this stamp-sales-tax scheme now sponsored by many. The manufacturers' sales tax is first paid by the manufacturers, and said by some to be absorbed by the manufacturers. Many of us firmly believe that it would, in a very large way, be passed on to and ultimately paid by the consumer. There is no doubt about who would pay all the taxes under this stamp-sales-tax scheme. It would all be paid by the poor, and no one else.

The manufacturers' general sales-tax system would exempt food, clothing, medicine, and other necessities of life. The stamp sales tax device would raise most money out of food, clothing, medicine, and the necessities of life and exempt luxuries and expensive expenditures of great wealth. But it is urged that the poor ought to be willing to pay this tax on money spent by them in order to raise a large sum

of money, part to be given back to the poor and the balance to be graciously given to the rich. This is the old, old scheme of the poor—the farmer included—doing all the paying for themselves and everybody else.

Of course, this stamp-sales-tax scheme is vicious for many reasons. I have attempted to discuss in some detail only one bad feature. And yet I have heard at least one man argue that this kind of a taxing conglomeration, if enacted into law, would immediately solve the depression, put into effect real farm relief, put the railroads and all industry back on a paying basis, eliminate unemployment, and make our people prosperous forever.

In this connection I am reminded of the story of the insane twin who was carried by his twin brother to a lunatic asylum. When they reached the asylum each claimed that the other was insane and should be locked up. The keeper called up the sheriff back home in an effort to get the real facts. The sheriff told the keeper to talk to them and decide which one to lock up. The keeper said, "One says he is a road builder and going to build a concrete bridge to the moon." The sheriff said, "This must be the crazy one." The keeper says, "Yes; but I don't know; the other one says he has worked out a plan to solve the depression by taxing enough money out of the poor to divide up with everybody and make everybody rich."

Mr. Speaker, as I have repeatedly said, I am very much opposed to the scheme to issue an enormous amount of certificates as currency and deliver \$10 worth to every man, woman, and child with a proviso that they circulate as money, but that a 2 per cent stamp tax be levied and collected every time this certificate currency is passed or paid by one person to another in a business transaction, because this device imposes a vicious sales tax without the exception of food, clothing, medicine, or other necessities of life, puts a tax on spending money instead of on hoarding money, levies and collects too large a tax from consumers and the public generally, would be too expensive in administration, would encourage dishonesty, would not put enough additional money in circulation, would not furnish enough additional money to each of those most in need of money, and would squeeze out of the poor too large an amount of money in a few days without commensurate benefits to the people now most in need and whom we must help if this Nation is to long endure.

As I said on the floor of this Congress several weeks ago, during this emergency I would gladly support a bill to put a tax on hoarding money, but not on spending money, as is sought by the sponsors of this stamp-sales-tax scheme.

During this emergency, in order to help the farmers, overcome unemployment, and relieve the present awful situation, I would gladly vote for a bill to give every poor man, poor woman, and poor child not only \$10 each, but, if necessary, \$100 each in taxable hoarding-proof currency, with 12 spaces on each, the size of a postage stamp and each space dated; the dates to represent the first day of 12 consecutive months.

As Irving Fisher says—

This gift would be from all of us to all of us (and so no gift at all), the object being merely to increase circulation and raise the price level.

Each \$1 bill would be legal tender provided a 1-cent stamp—and not a 2-cent stamp—covered all spaces bearing past first of the month dates. A \$5 bill would be the same, but the stamp must be a 5-cent denomination and so on, with each bill to carry each month one 1-cent stamp for each dollar of its face value. Every time a date passed it would be covered with a stamp, and 12 stamps would be required each year. At the end of the year a new bill with 12 more spaces could be secured upon return of the old bill which could not longer circulate, and the same system would go on for nine years, or 108 months, at which time \$1.08 in stamps would have been used for every \$1 of this kind of money, and then new nontaxable bills would be issued to the then holders of this kind of money. It will be seen at a glance that this plan would put enough additional money in circulation to do some good—possibly \$100 to every man,

woman, and child—would not be one-hundredth part the burden to the poor that the plan I have been criticizing would cause, and could be much more easily administered.

The objectionable sales-tax plan would require the purchase of stamps every few minutes if the money changed hands rapidly, would occasion all kind of expense, and delay and force people to be dishonest or waste much time and money trying to get stamps or not use the money when they needed it but had no stamp and were remote from a post office. It would also be impossible to tell whether stamps were put on the sales-tax money every time it passed hands and thus there would be a riot of law violations and an unheard-of orgy of bureaucratic snooping and expense.

The antihoarding scheme now suggested by me would be simple and everybody with any of this money on the first of the month would know how much in stamps to get and exactly where to stick them on the money. Under the sales-tax plan counterfeiting would flourish for the counterfeiter could put the stamp where he pleased, and, of course, would put it over the defective portion of his spurious money. The scheme I am advocating as emergency legislation would not permit this; there would be a specific space for each stamp.

My plan would put a tax on the hoarding of money, not on spending it; the man who locked it up would have to pay 1 cent a month for each dollar, while the people who spent this money forty times or more between the first of one month and the first of the next would not have to pay any tax at all.

Under the sales-tax-stamp scheme sponsored by some, if any of the money passed fifty times in a month, the full value would be required in taxes. My scheme would only require 1 per cent tax a month or 12 per cent a year. It is even boasted by one of the sponsors of the other scheme that the full value of the money would be squeezed out of the poor in 12 months or probably much less time. My scheme is so arranged as to spread this tax out over nine years. The other scheme would not be uniform, stamps would be on top of stamps, sometimes seven or more thicknesses of stamps, and no one could tell how many more would be required or whether the required number had been put on, and the Government would not know where or when to have money ready for redemption. Not so with my emergency plan; it would be simple, inexpensive, easily administered, and easily understood.

I said a little while ago I would have this money issued to every poor man, poor woman, and poor child. I deliberately used the adjective "poor." I would not let any of it be issued to the extremely rich unless in exchange for some commodity of equal value. It should be issued to all those who have no homes of their own or who are about to lose their homes or are already in danger of losing out financially unless help comes speedily.

The amount of money to each should be enough to turn the tide back, be that \$100 or \$500 to each person. If something is to be done along this line, let us do enough to get results. Only \$10 to every man, woman, and child, rich and poor, all to be taxed out of the poor, will not get us anywhere. It would not be a drop in the bucket. In fact, in the end it would do much more harm than good.

My emergency plan would encourage the circulation of currency. It would increase both the volume and velocity of the circulation of our medium of exchange.

Another serious and even fatal objection to the sales-tax-stamp plan is that the tax is so heavy until in a few months and probably in only a few days the stamps would equal the face value of the certificate, thus forcing its redemption in ordinary nontaxable money, which to a large extent by this time would be back in the large banks for an additional hoarding. By this sales-tax scheme an enormous amount of money would have been squeezed and pumped out of the poor in a few weeks, be back in the banks, and the average citizen would have lost more than he gained.

My plan could not be terminated, except by an act of Congress, for nine years, and until terminated would put

a burden on hoarding and encourage and stimulate the circulation of currency. No bank would want to pay 12 per cent per year for this money, to be stacked away in their vaults. If they wished to hold a billion dollars of this money idle for a year, they could do so by paying \$120,000,000—\$1 for nearly every man, woman, and child in the United States—tax for their hoarding privilege.

The sales-tax plan which I am fighting would speedily and vigorously further bleed those who are already bled white—the poorest of the poor—to raise an enormous amount of money for the rich to further hoard. My plan would tax all—the poor very slightly and the hoarders of wealth heavily—to raise funds for the poor, to increase the circulation of our currency both in volume and velocity, and to pull our country out of the present financial depression. The other scheme in the end would increase the depression and only help great wealth; my plan would help the baker, the candlestick maker, the laborer, the farmer, and every citizen of our great Nation.

My emergency plan would put immediate purchasing power in the hands of every consumer, including the unemployed. These new hoarding-proof dollars would constitute an addition to the circulation and would travel with greater velocity than the present dollars. My plan would overcome unemployment, stimulate the price of farm products, without putting any unnecessary strain on the Treasury.

The plan which I have been criticizing and which would provide for giving every person, rich or poor, \$10, with the whole amount to be immediately pumped back out of the necessities of the poor, could not possibly be of real service to our people in this awful time. This new sales-tax scheme would only add to our distressing plight. If any benefit was temporarily felt from this sales-tax scheme, it would not last long enough, and leave our people in worse condition than if it had not been enacted at all. It would be like giving a starving man a bowl of soup and immediately pumping it back out of him and expecting the process to prove most beneficial to him.

The plan which I have just advocated is the best plan along this line ever suggested.

At best, all these plans are only temporary expedients, and by no means should be accepted as a cure-all. The benefits which my plan would bring would be only temporary and should be followed up at once by some real legislation dealing with the banking or currency problem, with the transportation question, with farm relief, with unemployment, and other problems too numerous to mention—all on a broad and permanent basis.

Just as the good physician must be most careful in administering strychnine as a temporary relief, so should Congress be most careful in administering to our suffering Nation relief of the nature I have been discussing. It is so easy to give too large a dose. Especially is this true when those who are helping write the bills—helping mix the medicine, so to speak—are most anxious to do something to destroy the patient in furtherance of their own selfishness. For instance, those of great wealth who want to be relieved of all income taxes, all estate taxes, all inheritance taxes, and all taxes on great wealth are trying to write into every bill for the relief of the poor at this time some sales-tax scheme. The plan which I have been criticizing is most obnoxious, because it is loaded down with this very sort of thing. The allotment plan of farm relief has had so much of the sales-tax scheme pumped into it until it should not pass in its present form. If the sales tax is to be adopted as a national policy, let us see that it is put over in the open and with proper exemptions, and not written into some plan called farm relief or for the benefit of the poor, with no exemption except for the immensely rich, who should bear most of the tax burdens.

There are two very dangerous kinds of Members of Congress—one class who are outright against the average individual and for the men of great wealth, and another class, who, from inexperience or indifference, jump at legislative conclusions and vote for anything labeled "For the farmer" or for the masses of common people, without careful con-

sideration of the proposal in its minutest detail. The former class are less dangerous; they are in the open, and the public knows what to expect of them. The latter class misleads the public by their protestations of love for the people, and yet blindly do more harm than if all expected them to be opposing the farmer, the laborer, and the common run of people.

At no time has there been greater need for men in Congress with ability, honesty, and experience, who will study all these problems to the fullest extent and then vote their honest convictions and not be led by any man or group of men with sinister or selfish motives.

Again referring to the letter written me by Mr. Waters from which I read during the earlier part of my present discussion, let me say that his idea to raise money to help the farmer meets my heartiest approval. I, though, would want to raise this money along the line just suggested by me. I would gladly support my plan of raising this money for the purpose of refinancing all the loans of the farmers so as to get a large part of their loans written off, their interest eliminated or reduced to the minimum, and all loan foreclosures stopped and homes heretofore sold returned to the original owners under an arrangement enabling these folks to pay for and keep their homes. I would want the plan extended to enable others who do not have homes but want them, to buy them, pay for them, and enjoy them.

All these things can be done by proper temporary legislation in connection with my contract system of farm relief, in connection with my plan to monetize farm mortgages, and in connection with other farm-relief plans I have from time to time discussed, and which I shall not further discuss at this time.

During this discussion I have from time to time referred to the plan which more nearly meets my approval than any other as "my plan." It is my plan in the sense that I prefer it to other plans of this general class. I want though to state that I did not originate it nor any similar plan. These kinds of plans for raising and putting in circulation mediums of exchange have been in use many, many years. It is stated by reliable authority that a plan along the lines of the one advocated by me was sponsored by Silvio Gesell, of Argentina, in 1890. For some time a plan something like these plans has been in operation and known as the Great Falls, Mont., plan. Some time ago a somewhat similar plan was in operation in Schwanenkirchen, a small Bavarian village of Germany. Hundreds of such plans have been used for many, many years.

I now have in my possession a Douglas Clearing House Association certificate for \$1 and being No. 1 of series A of an issue used by the banks of Coffee County in 1907 as a medium of exchange. On the front page of this certificate is an agricultural design and language in addition to the name of the certificate, number, and so forth, as follows:

DOUGLAS, GA.

This certifies that the banks composing the Douglas Clearing House Association have deposited with B. H. Tanner, J. M. Ashley, B. Peterson, J. A. Davis, and Jeff Kirkland, trustees of said clearing-house association, securities to the value of \$1.50, to secure the bearer hereof the payment of the sum of \$1 in lawful money of the United States, payable on or before the 1st day of March, 1908. This certificate is issued in accordance with the proceedings of a meeting of said association held on the 7th day of November, 1907, and will be received on deposit or in payment of debts due any bank in said clearing house.

This certificate is signed by E. L. Tanner and F. L. Sweat, for trustees.

On the back of this certificate is the following:

Payment of the within certificate is guaranteed by the following banks composing the Douglas Clearing House Association: Union Banking Co., Peterson Banking Co., Citizens Bank, Merchants & Farmers Bank, Nicholls, Ga.; Pearson Banking Co., Pearson, Ga.

As attorney for the Citizens Bank of Douglas, I helped to organize and was present at the meeting mentioned in this certificate, bought the first certificate issued, still have it, and know that this medium of exchange was then not only used in Douglas but also in many other cities in Georgia and other States to a great advantage to the banks and people gener-

ally. I repeat, these plans of raising emergency mediums of exchange during financial depressions are almost as old as the human race. They only differ in the methods provided for the redemption of this temporary currency.

Congress should at the earliest possible moment put in force some temporary method of helping the present situation. I again insist, though, that, regardless of what temporary measures may be put into effect, it would be a national tragedy to accept temporary relief plans as the perfection of a real permanent relief program. Real permanent prosperity can only come by the enactment of currency legislation preventing another depression such as we now have, and by legislation properly solving other economic problems, well known to all of us. The banking and currency question is the greatest of all economic problems. Let this problem be properly solved by permanent basic legislation and not by some temporary expedient, and an enduring, ample foundation will have been constructed on which to build and maintain a great nation of happy, prosperous, contented people.

Mr. Speaker, it is an awful indictment against our Government and against civilization that a depression should occur, that makes necessary even the consideration of an emergency currency, such as now advocated by many. These expedients should be used in the most extreme emergencies, with the greatest possible caution, and after the most careful consideration. It is to be regretted exceedingly that the present emergency is so grave and fraught with such dangerous potentialities as to force all patriotic thinking men to feel that the time is here for the most heroic remedy at the earliest possible moment.

Let us apply at once such vigorous emergency relief as may be necessary, but let us not forget to be careful; apply the proper remedy in the proper amount and, above all, not get the impression that an emergency relief program is to be accepted as a lasting accomplishment and will bring the genuine relief of a well-thought-out program for not only the restoration of prosperity but for the establishment of permanent justice and equality between all our people.

If we must use emergency remedies—and all must admit such are necessary—then, let enough of the right kind be used at once to save our Nation; and, having saved it and our people, let us build for them and theirs the permanence of the ages.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1933.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4597. An act to restore to their former retired status in the Regular Army of the United States persons who resigned such status to accept the benefits of the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735), and for other purposes;

S. 5260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pearl River at or near Columbia, Miss; and

S. 5261. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Tombigbee River at or near Old Cotton Gin Port, Miss.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by au-

thority of the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1933.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 23, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, January 23, 1933, as reported to the floor leader:

LABOR

(10 a. m.)

Continue hearings on 5-day-week and 6-hour-day proposal.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.—Bridge Subcommittee.)

Hearing on S. 2915, bridge across the Big Sandy River between Kenova, W. Va., and Catlettsburg, Ky.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

875. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the Alien Property Custodian on proceedings had under the trading with the enemy act for the year ended December 31, 1932 (H. Doc. No. 425); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

876. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report from the Secretary of State, recommending an appropriation in the sum of \$3,500 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Third International Conference on Private Aerial Law to be held in Rome, Italy, in 1933; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 14363. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on the Public Lands was discharged from the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 517) authorizing the fixing of grazing fees on lands within national forests, and the same was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14359) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 14360) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to extend the period of restriction in lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes," approved May 10, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 496), as amended by the act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. L. 1108); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 14361) to create a department of general welfare, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 14362) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924, making the adjusted-service certificate issue to World War veterans negotiable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14363) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CROSS: A bill (H. R. 14364) to restore confidence by raising commodity prices through expanding the currency by using silver to broaden the metallic monetary base while preserving the gold standard; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 14365) to provide for the refinancing of farm-mortgage indebtedness over a period of 50 years at 4 per cent interest with first annual payment commencing 3 years after date of mortgage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 567) to provide a 1-year suspension period on certain debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 14366) granting an increase of pension to Katherine A. Ogden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALDRIGE: A bill (H. R. 14367) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. S. O'Brien against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 14368) granting a pension to Ethel Gard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14369) for the relief of Arthur A. Rohe; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PARTRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 14370) for the relief of Arthur David Roderick; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14371) granting a pension to Frances E. Tucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9733. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition of residents of Gasport and Lockport, N. Y., urging support of stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9734. Also, petition of Hope Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Buffalo, N. Y., and members of the Men's Community Bible Class, First Methodist Church, Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9735. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Charles Kellett, 44 Bedlow Avenue; Margaret L. Deery, 484 Broadway; and John C. Beebe, 24 Van Zandt Avenue, Newport; William H. Darling, 36 Jefferson Avenue, Riverside; John L. Goodwin, 8 Norwich Avenue; and John J. Egan, 55 River Avenue, Providence, all of the State of Rhode Island, whereby 519 citizens of the United States request that in the consideration and action on pension legislation for the veterans of any war in which the United States may have been engaged, no repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents, be made; to the Committee on Pensions.

9736. By Mr. CORNING: Petition of Marine Corps League, Hudson-Mohawk detachment, Albany, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9737. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Montgomery County, N. Y., opposing every legislative act that

would legalize alcoholic liquors stronger than one-half of 1 per cent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9738. Also, petition of citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., urging passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9739. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Crockery Board of Trade of New York, urging the return of the 2-cent rate on first-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9740. Also, petition of the Commercial Investment Trust (Inc.), protesting against the publicity given names of past and prospective borrowers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9741. By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of numerous citizens of Spann, Wayne County, Ky., opposing the repealing or weakening of the eighteenth amendment and prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9742. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Railroad Employees and Tax Payers Association (Inc.), of Richmond, Va., and vicinity, protesting against unregulated trucks, busses, waterways, and other forms of transportation entering into competition with the roads, and urging that the Government give the railroads its business wherever possible; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9743. Also, letters of Burton Hamilton, local manager, Long-Bell Lumber Sales Corporation, of Perry, and of R. H. Johnson, local manager, Long-Bell Lumber Sales Corporation, of Woodward, Okla., urging support of House bill 13790, designated to protect American goods when competing with imports of countries with depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9744. Also, petition of the Crusaders for Economic Liberty, Chattanooga, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 11898, a bill to establish economic liberty in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9745. Also, petition of the Evansville Chamber of Commerce, Evansville, Ind., urging support of House bill 11642; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9746. By Mr. GIBSON: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Burlington, Vt., protesting against any change in the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and opposing the legalizing of beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9747. Also, resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Orleans, Vt., protesting against any change in the eighteenth amendment, and urging enforcement of the amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9748. Also, resolution of the Burlington (Vt.) American Legion Post, No. 2, opposing reductions in veterans' expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9749. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Petition of Tri-State Packers' Association (Maryland, New Jersey, and Delaware), urging Congress to adopt emergency legislation to compensate for the effect of reduced currency on imports into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9750. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of International Falls Trades and Labor Assembly, International Falls, Minn., urging proper tariff to protect the pulp and paper industry of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9751. Also, petition of Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, Owatonna, Minn., urging enactment of the Capper-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9752. Also, petition of Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, Owatonna, Minn., requesting that the Secretary of Agriculture forbid the publication of any misleading statements favoring the voluntary domestic-allotment plan; and urging that the Farm Board be abolished; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9753. Also, petition of Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, Owatonna, Minn., urging economy in Government expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9754. Also, petition of Minnesota Implement Dealers' Association, Owatonna, Minn., urging revision of bankruptcy laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9755. Also, petition of Minnesota State Legislature, urging enactment of the Frazier bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9756. Also, petition of Ladies Society of B. of L. E. & F., Dilworth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 10023; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9757. Also, petition of Advertising Club, Hibbing, Minn., urging restoration of a 2-cent postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9758. Also, petition of Lutheran Brotherhood, Madison, Minn., protesting against legalizing beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9759. Also, petition of Lutheran Brotherhood, Madison, Minn., protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9760. Also, petition of Minnesota Department of Reserve Officers Association, urging that the established military policy of the United States as defined in the national defense act be adhered to; that the Regular Army be kept at its present commissioned and enlisted strength; and that summer training be continued for not less than 23,000 reserve officers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9761. Also, petition of Chippewa County Holiday Association, Montevideo, Minn., urging enactment of the Frazier bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9762. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Resolutions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Highland and Larkinburg, Kans., urging the establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission and to declare the industry a public utility; to regulate the trade practices of the industry; to supervise the selection and treatment of subject material during the processes of production; and to provide for the Government supervision of all pictures in foreign and interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9763. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of H. E. Schack, Hollis, Long Island, favoring revaluation of the gold standard; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9764. Also, petition of the Committee on International Justice and Goodwill of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, indorsing the joint resolution controlling exports of arms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9765. Also, petition of the National Committee on Education by Radio, Washington, D. C., concerning proposed amendment, section 14b, House bill 7716, of the radio act of 1927; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

9766. Also, petition of Commercial Investment Trust (Inc.), New York City, opposing publicity given borrowers from Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9767. Also, petition of the Crockery Board of Trade of New York, New York City, favoring the return of the 2-cent letter postage rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9768. By Mr. PARTRIDGE: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Association of Rockland, Me., protesting against modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, and favoring adequate appropriations for law enforcement and a campaign of education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9769. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Layo W. Meyer and nine other citizens of Hull, Ill., protesting against granting a pension to Mrs. Grace Coolidge; to the Committee on Pensions.

9770. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Crockery Board of Trade of New York, favoring the return of the 2-cent letter postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9771. Also, petition of Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring conferring upon the President of the United States control over exports of arms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9772. Also, petition of Washington Cooperative Egg & Poultry Association, favoring the United States participation in World Poultry Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9773. Also, petition of Commercial Investment Trust (Inc.), New York City, opposing publicity given to names of past and prospective borrowers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9774. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Hibbing Advertising Club, Hibbing, Minn., urging restoration of 2-cent postage on first-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9775. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution adopted at the 1933 session of the Minnesota Legislature, petitioning Congress to enact the Frazier bill, for relief of the farmers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9776. By Mr. SNOW: Resolution of meeting sponsored by the Greenville Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greenville, Me., opposing any legislation tending to nullify, weaken, or repeal the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9777. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of citizens of Oberlin, Kans., submitted by J. L. Fiske and H. B. Scott, and signed by 142 others, favoring the support of the Wheeler bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9778. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Railroad Employees and Taxpayers Association of New Jersey, opposing, without reservation, the ratification of the treaty calling for the construction of a deep waterway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

9779. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Yardley, Pa., favoring a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1933

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 4597. An act to restore to their former retired status in the Regular Army of the United States persons who resigned such status to accept the benefits of the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735), and for other purposes;

S. 5260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pearl River at or near Columbia, Miss.; and

S. 5261. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Tombigbee River at or near Old Cotton Gin Port, Miss.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal for the calendar days of January 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names: